

THE JOURNAL OF BIBLE AND RELIGION

*A Quarterly Devoted to Academic Study and Teaching
of Bible and Religion*

Vol. VII

November, 1939

Part IV

MYTH AND SYMBOL IN RELIGION.....	George F. Thomas	163
FORM CRITICISM AS I SEE IT.....	Ismar J. Peritz	172
A NOTE ON DR. PERITZ'S ARTICLE.....	Frederick C. Grant	177
MORE FORM CRITICISM.....	Mary E. Andrews	180
THE REFORMER MEETS A TAOIST.....	John De Young	184
LIGHT FROM NORTH SYRIA ON OLD TESTAMENT INTERPRETATION	Louise Pettibone Smith	185
BOOKS SUITABLE FOR USE IN UNDERGRADUATE COURSES IN THE NEW TESTAMENT	Elmer W. K. Mould	191
EDITORIAL: INTEGRATING RELIGION AND HIGHER EDUCATION		199
BOOK REVIEWS:		
BOSLEY, HAROLD A., THE QUEST FOR RELIGIOUS CERTAINTY.....		201
By Edgar Sheffield Brightman		
FOSTER, FRANK HUGH, THE MODERN MOVEMENT IN AMERICAN THEOLOGY		207
By William Henry Bernhardt		
LESLIE, ELMER A., THE PROPHETS TELL THEIR OWN STORY.....		204
By Robert H. Pfeiffer		
LEWIS, EDWIN, THE FAITH WE DECLARE		207
By William Henry Bernhardt		
MCCONNELL, FRANCIS J., JOHN WESLEY.....		208
By Ismar J. Peritz		
MACINTOSH, DOUGLAS CLYDE, SOCIAL RELIGION.....		202
By John C. Bennett		
MURRY, JOHN MIDDLETON, HEROES OF THOUGHT		209
By Carl E. Purinton		
PATON, WILLIAM, WORLD COMMUNITY		211
By Hugh Vernon White		
PIPER, OTTO, GOD IN HISTORY		205
By Joseph Haroutunian		
RADHAKRISHNAN, S., EASTERN RELIGIONS AND WESTERN THOUGHT.....		212
By Teresina Rowell		
THOMAS, GEORGE F., SPIRIT AND ITS FREEDOM.....		201
By Edgar Sheffield Brightman		
BOOK NOTICES		214
THE ASSOCIATION:		
PERSONNEL EXCHANGE		213
TENTATIVE PROGRAM OF NATIONAL MEETING		200
LETTERS TO THE EDITOR.....		224

CONTRIBUTORS TO THIS ISSUE

MARY E. ANDREWS is Associate Professor and Chairman of the Department of Religion, Goucher College, Baltimore, Maryland.

JOHN DE YOUNG was graduated from Beloit College in June, 1939, with high honors.

FREDERICK C. GRANT is Professor of Biblical Theology and Head of the Department of New Testament at Union Theological Seminary, New York. His latest contribution to New Testament literature is a translation of Martin Dibelius's *The Message of Jesus Christ*. He is to give the Haskell Lectures at Oberlin this winter on "The Gospel of the Kingdom."

ELMER W. K. MOULD was President of the National Association of Biblical Instructors in 1934 and has served as Treasurer since 1938. He has been Professor of Biblical History and Literature at Elmira College since 1919. His recent book, *Essentials of Bible History*, Nelson, 1939, has received high praise.

ISMAR J. PERITZ is Professor Emeritus of Biblical Languages and Literature and Willard Ives Professor of the English Bible, Syracuse University; a graduate of Drew Theological Seminary; received M. A. and Ph. D. degrees in Semitics from Harvard University; author of *Old Testament History*; contributor to *Encyclopaedia Biblica* and the *Abingdon Bible Commentary*; founder of the National Association of Biblical Instructors and its Journal; Editor Emeritus of the Journal.

LOUISE PETTIBONE SMITH, John Stewart Kennedy Professor of Biblical History at Wellesley College, received the degree of Ph. D. in Semitic Languages under Professor George Aaron Barton at Bryn Mawr College in 1917. Since 1915 she has been a member of the Department of Biblical History at Wellesley College.

GEORGE F. THOMAS was Professor of Philosophy at Dartmouth College for six years and has been for three years Professor of Philosophy at the University of North Carolina. He received an Honours B. A. degree in Theology at Oxford University in 1923 and took his Ph. D. in Philosophy at Harvard in 1929. He is the author of an essay in *The Nature of Religious Knowledge* and of a recent book entitled, *Spirit and Its Freedom*.

Published in February, May, August, and November by the National Association of Biblical Instructors. Publication Office, 36 East Main Street, Somerville, New Jersey. Editorial Office, Adelphi College, Garden City, New York. The subscription price is \$3.00 per annum. Single copies, 75 cents. Entered as second-class matter February 14, 1939, at the post office at Somerville, New Jersey, under the Act of August 24, 1912.

Journal of Bible and Religion

VOLUME VII

NOVEMBER - 1939

PART IV

Myth and Symbol in Religion

GEORGE F. THOMAS

AT FIRST sight, it might appear that myth in our modern world is only a matter of historical interest to students of religion. For a long time now our Protestantism, both orthodox and liberal, has been trying to minimize or even deny the symbolical element in Christianity. As Professor Urban has pointed out,¹ the result of the rejection of symbolism by Protestant orthodoxy has been Fundamentalist literalism and to many modernists the only alternative has seemed to be a virtually atheistic humanism. In a somewhat similar fashion, defenders of democracy in the political sphere have made their appeals to conscious reason or interest, as if democracy was above the need to conceive and express its convictions in challenging symbols and dramatic presentations. The result here has been the widespread success in democratic countries of vital but irrational myths of race or class. There are obvious signs, therefore, that the reign of rationalism in religion and politics has broken down and is coming to an end. In psychology the interest in the subconscious points in the same direction, while natural science, long regarded as an enemy of all thinking not aimed at literal description of fact, is emphasizing the constructive activity of the mind in all fields by pointing out the symbolic character of scientific knowledge itself.

According to rationalists, myth is a product of the fancy of primitive man work-

ing in an arbitrary way upon materials derived from sense and impulse. Its primary purpose is to suggest a plausible explanation of natural and human events in terms satisfactory to a pre-scientific, uncritical mentality. Such a view obviously leads to the conclusion that now that science has demonstrated its superiority in describing natural and historical phenomena, the day of myth is over. According to voluntarists, the purpose of myth is not intellectual but practical. Myth was originally secondary to the ritual it accompanied and ritual was intended to bring about very practical results in the interest of the group. It is not my purpose to criticise either of these views except to point out that both of them alike rest upon a vicious abstractionism. On the one hand, we have no reason to suppose that primitive man was interested in the scientific explanation of events quite apart from their relation to his interest; on the other, we have no reason to suppose that primitive man was utterly lacking in that sense of wonder, that curiosity, which is the father of science. But, apart from their abstractionism, these views are alike also in treating myth as if it had no relation to the religious experience of primitive men. It is mainly because of their neglect of the distinctively religious root of myth that rationalists degrade it to the status of bad science and voluntarists to the status of "human-all-too-human" practice.

But I should prefer, instead of attacking abstract and secular theories of myth such

¹Urban, W. M., *Journal of Religion*, January, 1939, "Symbolism as a Theological Principle."

as these, to set forth a more concrete and positive theory. According to the view of Empiricism, in the extreme form represented by Hume, the mind simply receives impressions, preserves them as ideas, and connects them with one another according to natural laws of association. This view of mind must be rejected, not only because it is psychologically false, but also because it cannot explain the most characteristic thing about the work of mind, its synthesis of its experiences by means of various systems of symbolic interpretation. Of these, scientific interpretation is one, mythical interpretation another. In short, if we accept the view that the human spirit is creative and formative, we must expect to find in myth one of the primary and natural forms into which it casts its experience.

Almost everyone but the extreme empiricist would probably agree so far. But many who would grant that the mind of primitive man is creative in his myths would deny that there is any method or principle by which it constructs them and would therefore regard them as purely arbitrary and fictitious. Now, Cassirer² has shown clearly and in detail that there is method in the process of myth-making. It is difficult, I may add, for moderns to grasp that method because they have such a different conception of method. Since the days of Bacon and Descartes modern thought has assumed that a consciously pursued method is all-important if the enterprise of thinking is to succeed. It has also assumed that the method so employed must be either that of observation and induction or that of deduction of conclusions from clear and distinct ideas. Modern science, after a long controversy between the claims of these two methods of Empiricism and Rationalism, has arrived at a sort of compromise calling for the former primarily in the natural and

social sciences and the latter in mathematics and logic. When the question is asked, however, What is to be done with the claims of metaphysics, of poetry, and of religion to truth, since they do not employ either of these approved methods of science? the answer of scientific dogmatists is likely to be essentially that given by the logical positivists, namely, that there is no truth at all in any of them. They are, all of them, expressions in emotive or hortatory language of our subjective feelings and wishes. In other words, science alone gives us truth; philosophy, poetry, and religion give us fictions.

Now, the only way to refute this narrow conception of method and of truth is to point out that the mind in fact does use other methods in its attempt to interpret its experience and that each of these yields results the validity of which must be examined on its own merits. Let us see what principles the mind of primitive man follows, however, unconsciously, when it constructs myths, insofar as they can be inferred from the myths themselves. The essential thing, Cassirer argues,³ is that it makes no clear distinctions, such as that between a myth and its meaning. Just as originally words were not distinguished from their meanings, myths and the ritual acts they accompany were not distinguished as symbols from the objects or events described and enacted. The myths and ritual acts belong to and work in the real world, not an inner, ideal world. As Cassirer puts it, the mythical world is "concrete" in that "the two moments, that of the thing and that of the meaning, pass into one another without distinction in it, that they have here grown together, become 'concretized' into an immediate unity." This is an expression, as I shall argue later, of the undifferentiated character of the world in the experience of primitive man. The important thing to notice at this point is that the "form of thought" and the "categories"

²Cassirer, Ernst: *Philosophie der Symbolischen Formen*, Vol. II, Pages 71 to 73.

³*Ibid*, Pages 96 to 98.

of mythical thinking are largely determined by the general lack of clear and sharp distinctions. Later scientific and philosophical analysis, for example, makes a distinction between the merely subjective and the objective, considering as objective only that which has stable character and stands in definite relations to other elements of experience. Myth, on the other hand, draws very uncertain lines between the objects of waking and dreaming experience, the states of life and death, the reality of a man and that of his picture or shadow, and so on. As we shall see later, myth is like poetry in that neither attempts to analyze the appearances of things into clearly defined elements for the purpose of synthesizing them into a new order according to logical principles.

Similarly, as Cassirer also points out, the causal relation as it is employed in myth is very different from that employed in science. Science isolates certain elements of a complex whole and treats them as the special causes of certain other elements. There is sought a regular relation between the causal event, A, and the resultant event, B, in a series of events which may have many intermediate members between A and B. The aim of this procedure is to explain a given event by reference to general laws of serial order according to which it necessarily occurs. In the causal explanation of myth, on the other hand, anything can cause anything, if it is in contact with it either by spatial contiguity or by temporal simultaneity. The coming of certain animals, for instance, brings the season connected with them. There is no interest in the intermediate events, but only in the beginning or cause A and the end or effect B. Hence, there is no such thing as regular, gradual change in stages; there is only metamorphosis. And the reason for both of these differences is that explanation is not a matter of necessity according to gen-

eral laws but a matter of free acts of individual agents. This quasi-teleological conception of causality is obviously dependent upon the dynamic view that that which moves in all things is a living energy, if not a spiritual activity; "mana," if not "spirit."

Hence, that which is perhaps more fundamental in myth for students of religion than the "form of thinking" (*Denkform*) is the "form of life" (*Lebensform*). Here, too, it is the lack of clear distinctions that is the most significant thing. Cassirer shows that, not only in the pre-animistic stage of "mana" but also in the animistic stage, there is no well-defined conception of a subjective or psychical as contrasted with a material reality. Only very gradually are the immateriality or spirituality, the unity, and the indivisibility of the "soul" discovered in mythical thinking. In the early stages, the soul is simply identified with the *life*, and the life is definitely located in the body. The unity of the soul is very dimly perceived in its different "life-phases," e. g. youth and maturity, and its "parts are often regarded as more or less independent entities."

"The decisive change occurs," says Cassirer, "when the emphasis of the soul-concept shifts, when the soul, instead of being regarded as the mere bearer or cause of the phenomena of life, is conceived as the subject of the moral consciousness. When the gaze is raised above the sphere of life to that of moral action, above the biological to the ethical sphere, the unity of the self wins precedence over the material or half-material idea of the soul."⁴

Perhaps the best example of this change in Greece is found in Socrates' conception of good fortune ("Eudaimonia"). Man wins good fortune, "becomes released from fear of the unknown, from fear of demons, when he feels himself, his inner being, ruled no more by a dark mythical power, when he knows himself able to give form to his life by clear insight, by a principle of knowledge and

⁴*Ibid.*, Page 205.

will." Moreover, the distinction of the spiritual principle from all material reality is attained in the theoretical as well as the moral consciousness. When the Upanishads conceive of the self as something which is unlike objects and cannot be defined by analogy with objects, they are treating it as a pure subject for which everything in the world of objects is a mere "appearance."

But these are phenomena of developed, indeed, of mature ethical and spiritual religion. In primitive myth, it is the feeling of the unity of all life that is dominant, rather than belief in the spirituality of the human self. Dionysian orgy and totemistic taboo alike are explicable only in terms of that unity of feeling. Not only are men and animals united by it, but both are closely bound together with the gods. It is only as the religious consciousness matures that men are clearly distinguished from gods above and animals below them. At the same time, the individual discovers his own independent, personal existence over against the unity of life of the social group. In short, the primitive feeling of unity is broken and man finds for himself a definite position in the world. From the time he discovers his uniqueness as a moral agent and a thinking subject, he raises himself above the natural order of processes and living beings and at the same time asserts his responsibility to the divine beings above him.

This is the point at which what I have called "mature" religion arises. For it is characteristic of such religion that in it the undifferentiated unity of meaning and existence, of subjective and objective, of spiritual and material, of man with nature and the divine, is broken. The spirit, while it continues to use mythical forms and

signs, can now regard them in a different way than before and in a sense raises itself above them. This, I take it, is what characterizes the later "broken" myths Tillich³ contrasts with primitive "unbroken" myths. A myth is broken, he says, "through the knowledge of the unconditioned transcendence of the divine." In other words, while "the unbroken myth denies transcendence in all its affirmations, draws the divine into the contradiction and change of the conditioned," as he says, the broken myth uses symbols drawn from the relative for that which is known to transcend all that is relative.

Thus, the relation of myth to religion is neither that of identity nor that of difference, but that of identity with difference. For myth as myth is an essential part of primitive religion, but myth must become symbol before it can be used by mature religion. The explanation of this is that religion must conceive and express in myth insights which are not fully conveyed by the sensuous forms of myth. Despite this fact, however, religion cannot dispense with myth altogether except at the price of becoming a mere ineffable religious experience without metaphysical or moral implications. Hence, mature religion must preserve a middle course between the primitive acceptance of myth and the mystical tendency to reject all sensuous forms as distortions of divine reality. In short, myth is an integral part of mature religion, but only when it is recognized as symbolic of that which cannot be fully expressed in any sensuous form.

The relation of myth to poetry is also that of identity with difference. Since myth is a product of a relatively undifferentiated consciousness, theoretical and practical interests are not yet separated in it. Thus, we cannot speak of myth as purely scientific or philosophical, for it is also bound up with magical or religious rites which meet the practical needs of the

³Tillich, Paul, *Die Religion in Geschichte und Gegenwart*, Vol. IV, p. 363, article entitled, "Mythus and Mythologie: I. Mythus, begrifflich und religionspsychologisch."

group. Rather, it is poetic in the sense that poetry expresses concrete experiences in which thought and incipient action, insight and feeling, are fused. But myth is not "pure" poetry, "mere" poetry, unless it comes to be entertained by the imagination primarily for its aesthetic qualities. This happens only when it is at odds with the serious beliefs about reality or/and the higher moral interests of the group. Thus, myth is the poetic matrix out of which the scientific and philosophic quest for truth, the moral quest for goodness, and the artistic quest for intrinsically significant form and beauty later emerge as objects of specialized interests.

So much for the nature of myth in primitive religion. What is of primary interest to us, however, is the place of myth as symbol in mature religion. The first thing that strikes one in this connection is the presupposition of dualism involved in symbolism. No strictly monistic philosophy, materialistic or idealistic, has any real place for symbolism. There must be a fundamental contrast between two orders, whether of the eternal and the temporal, the spiritual and the natural, or the ideal and the actual. In the Judaeo-Christian tradition all three pairs of opposites play an important role. Man, who belongs to both orders, uses the visible objects and events of the temporal order to symbolize the invisible realities and ideals of the eternal order. Symbols can mediate between the two orders because they represent traces of the one in the other.

The second thing is the dramatic character of much religious symbolism. Religion, Urban says,⁶ is experience of the "numinous" and the language in which such an experience must be expressed is that of poetry. It is, of course, metaphysical poetry, not "pure" poetry. Its symbols are not to be taken as literally true in the sense of exactly corresponding to facts like a photograph; rather, they are disclosures of the "numinous"

character of ultimate reality. More specifically, the religious experience contains an insight into the harmony of value and reality in a Being that is perfect, and religions seek to express this insight in concrete, dramatic symbols.

But the question arises, Why must the symbols used to express this insight be dramatic in nature? I believe we can discover the answer if we reflect upon the point we have just made; i.e., that mature religion starts from a recognition of a dualism between the eternal and the temporal, the ideal and the actual. For religion, unlike philosophy, is not interested in this dualism primarily as an object of contemplation, but in the process by which it is bridged, as the eternal impinges upon the temporal and the ideal is realized in the actual. The religious person does not simply worship the divine Being in abstracto, he worships that Being as He realizes His ideal purposes in the actual world of time. It has been pointed out that there is very little doctrine of God as He is in Himself, in the Old Testament. The Old Testament books describe God as He creates the world, calls Israel to be His chosen people, punishes her by exile, promises a new Kingdom in the future, and the like. In other words, the God of the Old Testament creates the cosmos and moves through human history to fulfil His purposes in a series of dramatic acts. Nor is the New Testament essentially different from the Old in this respect; indeed, by stressing somewhat more the universal scope of God's purpose, and by sharpening the contrast between that purpose of love and the forces such as Mammonism and Caesarism opposed to it, it heightens the tension between the ideal and the actual. Hence the elaboration of the myths of the first and second Adam with the dogmas of original sin and redemption corresponding to them. The breaking up of the unity of man with God that prevailed in the

⁶Urban, W. M.: *Journal of Religion*, January, 1939.

Garden is thus made the explanation of that dualism, that alienation between man and God, which is now so universal; and the restoration of the unity of the human and the divine orders already being experienced by the faithful is explained by a redemptive act of God in Christ. It should be obvious even from this brief review of central aspects of Hebrew and Christian experience, that the only suitable expression for them is dramatic.

We must not, however, overstate the point. Christian beliefs, at least, are held by all Christians to have a basis in actual historical events, such as the birth and crucifixion of Christ, without which the beliefs would be meaningless. In a sense, therefore, the language of Christianity must be the language of history, not that of drama. Moreover, the authenticity of these believed facts, insofar as it is in question, must be proved by historical and philosophical arguments. Insofar as theology deals with the grounds of such religious beliefs, its language cannot be wholly symbolic in the sense of poetic and dramatic; it must be in part the conceptual language which alone is suitable to proof of historical propositions. Doubtless poetic language is dominant in dogmatic, as distinguished from apologetic, theology; for dogmatic theology often simply expounds religious beliefs in a more systematic manner than is possible in the pulpit. But any theology that attempts to go beyond eloquent expression to proof of historical beliefs must use the language of concepts.

But the full significance of Urban's view that theology must employ distinctive symbols comes out when we consider, not the historical and as such dramatic elements of theology, but the attributes of God as He is in Himself. According to Aquinas' doctrine of analogy, we have real knowledge of the attributes of God but the names we apply to Him cannot be applied in the same

way to Him and to creatures. In other words, when we say God is intellect or will or love, the content is the same as in ordinary use of those terms but the mode of signification is different. This doctrine is defended by Aquinas—and rightly, I should hold—as a sane mean between the anthropomorphism of the simple-minded and the agnosticism of negative theology. It is bound up, of course, with the doctrine of analogy, for when we apply a name to God with a different mode of signification we are simply using it as an analogy. This doctrine of analogy, as Cassirer points out, rests upon the presupposition that the divine Logos is present at every level of created being, so that the objects of nature and events of history furnish traces and indications of the divine nature itself. This suggests that the names we apply to God contain a core of truth surrounded by mystery.

It also suggests the two main questions we must raise concerning this "classical" theory, as Urban calls it, of religious symbols. The first has to do with the idea of a core of "literal" truth in such symbols. Urban argues⁷ that all knowledge, including scientific knowledge, is symbolic, and that the belief in the possibility of "blunt" truth, i.e. truth without any symbolic element in it, is doomed to disappointment. But when he claims that there is a "literal" truth enshrined in a religious symbol such as "love," is he not expressing such a belief in "blunt" truth himself? The answer seems to be that he is not really arguing for a "literal" truth in such a symbol but simply for a "real" truth. That is, he is arguing that though love as we know it is not a "copy" of the love of God so that there is a correspondence in detail between Divine and human love, there really is love in God, a love which if we knew it clearly would be seen to be fundamentally similar to or at least continuous with human love. In other words, however different the "mode

⁷*Ibid.*

of signification" when we apply such a perfection to God, the "essence" of the perfection is not affected.

But that raises the second and really important question: how do we know that a change in the "mode of signification" does not involve an equally radical change in the "essence?" It must be remembered that we are applying predicates derived from the finite, the relative, the temporal, and the imperfect to the infinite, absolute, eternal, and perfect. What right have we to do so? This is, of course, the objection Hume raised against the cosmological and the teleological arguments for the existence of God. The one involved an application of the causal relation as derived from observed connections between temporal events in the world of experience, to a supposed (but not observed) connection between that world as a whole and a first cause outside it. The other relied upon an analogy between the order of the world and the design of a machine in order to draw another analogy between the observed intelligent cause of the latter and a supposed intelligent cause of the former. But how do we know that the world is grounded upon any *cause* external to it, or that, if it is, that cause is more like intelligent *mind* than, say, the blind force with which plants grow? In other words, how can we use any categories or analogies derived from experience for a hypothetical entity that is beyond experience? And, if we are forced to use some analogy, why use one rather than another?

This seems to me to be the ultimate question about symbols in religion, and it forces us to go beyond symbols themselves for an answer. Perhaps part of the answer is to be found where Urban suggests, in a direct, intuitive experience of the divine which reveals to us *a priori* (i. e. without the necessity of other, empirical evidence) that our imperfect, finite experience of good implies an infinite, perfect being. If so, that which

serves as evidence that certain symbols such as love have real truth in them is a kind of religious experience that is at the same time metaphysical insight. But in view of the criticisms that have been made recently, both in America and abroad, of the idea that religious experience provides us with knowledge that is in and by itself certain, this can at best provide us with a starting point. Indeed, this seems to be Professor Urban's real meaning. Without such a religious intuition to start with, he says, the empirical arguments of natural or philosophical theology are doomed to failure. That seems to suggest that the intuition of a Perfect Being and the symbolic statement of it must be verified by further experience and reflection.

If so, the conclusion that is being drawn in more than one quarter, that symbolic knowledge is not only super-rational but also in some sense irrational, must be rejected in the interest of symbolic knowledge itself. For a symbol which goes beyond reason in such a way as to contradict reason is not likely to commend itself to rational men. Professor Urban does not champion the irrationalist point of view, for, while he is convinced that the language of theology must be symbolical rather than conceptual, he holds that the truth enshrined in such language can be intuited and in a measure proved by reason. But Reinhold Niebuhr, Nicolas Berdyaev, and others go much farther. Niebuhr, in "*Beyond Tragedy*,"⁸ argues that the relation between time and eternity can be expressed only in symbolic terms, while "a rational or logical expression of the relationship invariably leads" either to pantheism or to a "false supernaturalism" of a dualistic sort. Yet he offers not a single proof of this sweeping generalization concerning reason. What is there about reason that forces it into pantheism or a false dualistic supernaturalism? I confess that I cannot discover any answer to that question in Nie-

⁸Niebuhr, R.: *Beyond Tragedy*, p. 4.

buhr's essay. But there are some assertions which give a possible explanation of his statement. "Buddhism," Niebuhr says,⁹ "is much more rational than Christianity. In consequence, Buddhism finds the finite and temporal world evil. Spinozism is a more rational version of God and the world than the biblical account; but it finds the world unqualifiedly good and identical with God." We are told here that Buddhism is more rational than Christianity because it finds the world evil, while Spinozism is also more rational because it finds the world good. Christianity is less rational than either because it finds the world good but imperfect. This suggests that, though the Christian view is truer, it is less rational; and that, though the Buddhistic and Spinozistic views are less true, they are more rational. To me the implication that an assertion about existence can be more rational and at the same time less true than another such assertion is false. Would it not seem as if Niebuhr is identifying "rational" with "consistent?" Both Buddhism and Spinozism are superficially more consistent than Christianity in that each predicates of the world one of a pair of opposites (i.e. good and evil) and denies the other, while Christianity predicates both. But it is not rational to achieve consistency by a one-sided assertion that ignores an important group of facts. And Christianity is not violating the logical principle of contradiction when it states that the world is both good and evil, unless it asserts both of one and the same thing at one and the same time and in one and the same respect, as it obviously does not.

In a similar fashion, Niebuhr discusses the myths of creation, the fall, the incarnation, and the like. Because they have found the idea of creation out of nothing unintelligible, he says, the philosophers and scientists have substituted causality for creation,

overlooking the fact that the novelty and the givenness of events are not accounted for by referring them causally to previous events without relating them to "a creative centre and source of meaning." Is Niebuhr forgetting the fact that the Humian view of causality, which he seems to have in mind, is not the last word of philosophy? that philosophical idealists, theists, and organicists have not accepted it but have insisted upon a spiritual or vital principle of a creative nature? As to the myth of the Fall, Niebuhr insists that the "rationalists" (who seem here to be all those who put faith in reason) explain evil as due to hypertrophied impulse, defect of knowledge, and the like, and expect it to be put to flight by fuller development of reason. Does he forget that the rationalistic Socratic theory of evil has been criticized sharply by a long line of thinkers and that many of these thinkers have emphasized the importance of training of will and education of feeling as well as strengthening of reason? Does he not know of philosophers who have, like him, stressed as the chief cause of evil the misuse of freedom, rather than strength of impulse or weakness of reason? Finally, Niebuhr says that the Incarnation is an outrage to reason because it asserts that the unconditioned divine entered into a complete union with the conditioned human without losing its own unconditioned character. If the Incarnation is stated in terms of an absolute dualism between divine and human, if the two natures are regarded at the outset as sheer opposites, then the Incarnation is an outrage to reason. But while the human reason working with that assumption produced the statements about God's relation to Christ in the Nicene and Chalcedonian creeds, it has also pointed out again and again the weakness of that premise and suggested other ways of expressing the divine-human nature of Jesus of Nazareth.

Thus, those who attempt to put symbols

⁹Niebuhr, R.: *Beyond Tragedy*, p. 7.

in opposition to reason are able to do so only by reducing reason to the mere function of deducing conclusions from premises in a consistent manner. They overlook the fact that reason is also the function of establishing and criticising premises after a careful survey of all the relevant data. Consistency in deduction is no more rational than the careful and comprehensive synopsis of all the facts which leads up to direct insight into first principles. The reason criticized by Niebuhr is simply consistent reasoning from principles which have not been rationally established in this way. The true answer to such a rationalism is not to attack reason in general for the mistakes of those whose powers of observation and insight have not matched their power of deduction, but to clear up their mistakes by better observation and insight. It is such keen observation and imaginative insight which lie behind

the best Christian symbols. By critical, rational discrimination of essence from accident in these symbols they may be saved from the literalism of the unimaginative and at the same time be held with deeper conviction by rational men. It is to this task, indeed, that Niebuhr and Berdyaev, both men of reason, have devoted themselves so successfully. It is a pity that they spend so much energy attacking the very instrument they use with such vigor and penetration and insisting upon the gulf between symbol and reason, thus opening the way for skeptics to assail all religious symbols as irrational and therefore arbitrary. For if the best religious symbols are to be defended as essentially true, it must be by a reason which will test them in the light of the whole of experience as interpreted by the deepest insights men can attain.

Albert Einstein on Religion and Science

"During the last century, and part of the one before, it was widely held that there was an unreconcilable conflict between knowledge and belief. The opinion prevailed among advanced minds that it was time that belief should be replaced increasingly by knowledge; belief that did not itself rest on knowledge was superstition, and as such had to be opposed.

"It is true that convictions can best be supported with experience and clear thinking. On this point one must agree unreservedly with the extreme rationalist. The weak point of his conception is, however, this, that those convictions which are necessary and determinant for our conduct and judgments, cannot be found solely along this solid scientific way.

"For the scientific method can teach us nothing else beyond how facts are related to, and conditioned by, each other. The aspiration toward such objective knowledge belongs to the highest of which man is capable, and you will certainly not suspect me of wishing to belittle the achievements and the heroic efforts of man in this sphere. Yet it is equally clear that knowledge of what *is* does not open the door directly to what *should be*. One can have the clearest and most complete knowledge of what *is*, and yet not be able to deduct from that what should be the *goal* of our human aspirations. . . .

"To make clear these fundamental ends and valuations, and to set them fast in the emotional life of the individual, seems to me precisely the most important function which religion has to perform in the social life of man. And if one asks whence derives the authority of such fundamental ends, since they cannot be stated and justified merely by reason, one can only answer: they exist in a healthy society as powerful traditions, which act upon the conduct and aspirations and judgments of the individuals; they are there, that is, as something living, without its being necessary to find justification for their existence. They come into being not through demonstration but through revelation, through the medium of powerful personalities. One must not attempt to justify them, but rather to sense their nature simply and clearly."

From an address entitled "The Goal," delivered at Princeton Theological Seminary, May 19, 1939.

Form Criticism As I See It

ISMAR J. PERITZ

THE PUBLICATION of Dibelius' *Die Botschaft von Jesus Christus* in English¹ is an occasion for a re-examination of the claims of Form Criticism; particularly because the translator, Professor Grant, has contributed in a recent issue of the *Journal* (February, 1939) a spirited defense of the new hypothesis and the reviewer of the translation, Professor Andrews, assumes in the last issue of the *Journal* (August, 1939) that the problem is settled. But there are some of us who are not yet convinced, even though we lay ourselves open to the charge of not being "alert;" for an hypothesis that strikes so deeply at the roots of historical Christianity demands the severest critical scrutiny.

The representatives of Form Criticism: Bultmann, Dibelius, Lietzmann, Lightfoot, Grant—hold a view of the historical mission and character of Jesus which is bound to vitiate their conclusions relating to the origin, preservation and transmission of the data on which the gospels are based. They say that Jesus was a rabbi like Hillel, and they go to rabbinic sources for literary analogies. So Professor Grant says: "But they (the gospels) are precisely the kind of record Jewish teaching received in that age . . . records of other Jewish teachers and leaders—Hillel, for example."² Dibelius offers³ alleged analogies in rabbinic literature, in spite of their later date, of stories and anecdotes, saying: "Similarly in a few Paradigms, questions of a Halahkic or an Hag-

ears of corn, but especially the tribute money and the Sadducean question are passages most strongly reminiscent of the corresponding rabbinic stories." But it is Bultmann⁴ who goes the full length. Because Jesus is called "Rabbi" he regards him as having belonged to the professional class known as scribes, trained and passed his examination as such; was called Herr Doctor, and practised the profession until John the Baptist converted him to become a prophet with an apocalyptic message. But even after this he followed his calling of a Rabbi. "He acted," says Bultmann, "as the teacher in the synagogues; surrounded himself with disciples; disputes over matters of law with disciples, opponents, and enquirers who come to him as a great rabbi. He disputes in the same forms as the Jewish rabbis, uses the same argument, same manner of speech; and like them coins sayings and parables. Jesus shows close relationship with the rabbis in the contents of his teachings." But this is preposterous because it stresses details that belong to the scribe and prophet alike and fails to recognize the vital elements wherein they differ. Jesus was not a scribe but a prophet. The scribes taught in schools (*beth hammidrash*) and charged admission fees. This is illustrated by the well-known story of Hillel snowed under on the roof of the school because he had not earned the coin necessary for admission. Jesus taught in the open and anywhere he could find an audience; and he taught women as well as men and common folk—the *am-haarez*—which was not the custom among the rabbis, but customary among the prophets. Jesus had the reputation of "having never learned," that is, of being untrained in rabbinic schools; and "he spake gadic kind are put to Jesus: fasting, rubbing

¹The *Message of Jesus Christ*, by M. Dibelius. Translated by F. C. Grant. Charles Scribner's Sons, 1939.

²Article: "Form Criticism and the Christian Faith," *Journal of Bible and Religion*, February 1939, pp. 9ff.

³From *Tradition to Gospel*, pp. 133ff.

⁴*Jesus*, 1929, pp. 55ff.

with appeal (authority) and not as the scribes."

The origin of the parity of Jesus and Hillel is not as well known as it ought to be. It grew out of Reformed Judaism which placed Jesus on a higher level: formerly he was regarded as an imposter who led Jews away from the Law; but now he was worthy to be compared with Hillel. It was Abraham Geiger, one of the founders of modern Judaism, who in 1864 said: "Jesus was a Pharisee, who followed in the steps of Hillel. He never uttered an original thought."⁵ This was simultaneous with or anticipated by a year or two by Renan:⁶

"He mostly followed Hillel in his teaching. Hillel had fifty years before uttered aphorisms which bore great similarity to his own. In consequence of his patience under poverty, the meekness of his character, his opposition to the priests and hypocrites, Hillel was properly speaking the real teacher of Jesus, if the name teacher may be mentioned at all where the subject is one of such sublime originality."

This highly imaginative picture of Jesus has since become the stock and trade of the modern Jewish view of Jesus represented by Montefiore, Abrahams, Klausner, and in current Jewish literature and pulpit. From the Jewish point of view it is a praiseworthy concession, a growing recognition and appreciation of Jesus, paving the way for a better mutual understanding. But as a Christian view it is incongruous and unfounded, although it is quite true that there were good and noble and spiritual Pharisees in the time of Christ. Jesus might have had Hillel as a teacher, but the facts point the other way.

⁵*Judenthum und Seine Geschichte*. 2 Aufl., Breslau, 1865.

⁶*The Life of Jesus*. English translation. New York: 1866.

⁷*Jesus und Hillel*. 3rd Ed. Leipzig: 1871. An English translation by P. C. Croll in *Elzevir Classics*, New York: 1884.

⁸*Jesus and the Pharisees*, p. 177.

⁹This accounts for the fact that the Jews never sang:

"How sweet the name of Hillel sounds
In a believer's ear;
It soothes his sorrows, heals his wounds;
And drives away his fear."

Consequently, it was natural that this Jewish view of Jesus should be questioned and controverted. This was done as soon as the new view appeared by the great Franz Delitzsch of the University of Leipzig. He had a first-hand knowledge of the rabbinic material; and he drew a striking contrast between Jesus and Hillel, and showed that they belonged to different spheres of activity and influence; and that there was no relation between them.⁷ While the argument on some phases is now antiquated, on the respective teachings it is still valid. In justice to both it must be emphasized that Jesus was the prophet and Hillel the scribe. Hillel drew up "the seven rules of Hillel," which laid the foundations of rabbinic exegesis, stressed the isolation of the Jews, and drove them into ghettos. Jesus and Hillel are the antipodes of social and religious democracy. Think of Paul placing them on a par. One built a fence around the ceremonial law, the other pulled it down. One gave ninety and nine per cent of his attention to such trivialities as whether it is permitted to eat an egg laid on the sabbath, while scarcely one per cent comprises what is recorded of him in the Mishnah that is of ethical and spiritual nature; while Jesus, on the other hand, repudiated legalism and gave all his attention to ethical and spiritual matters.

The view that Jesus was a Pharisee and scribe has shown itself in Form Criticism in the excision of anti-nomistic teachings of Jesus. While Dibelius retains some of it, Riddle⁸ excises it in toto, saying: "There is no possible place in the experience of Jesus for the conflicts with the Pharisees to have occurred as they are described. . . . They are the inventions of the church. Even a Klausner repeatedly declares that you cannot account for the anti-nomism of Paul without pre-supposing Jesus as his forerunner; but Form Criticism thus removes from the gospel records elements that give the reason for the hatred and rejection of Jesus and the mission of spiritual Christianity."⁹

It should be acknowledged, however, that Professor Grant¹⁰ and Professor Andrews¹¹ when they are not under direct influence of Form Criticism, do full justice to the prophetic character of Jesus.

But the assumption that Jesus was a Pharisee and scribe and not a prophet leads to a second erroneous consequence: namely, that Form Critics fail to go to the "writing" prophets for the analogies of the gospels as biography and history. The prophetic books of Amos and Hosea, Isaiah, but particularly Jeremiah, with touches of the Elijah and Elisha stories which contribute no inconsiderable part to the gospel records, are strikingly similar to the gospels as biography and history. None of them is biography in "our sense." They defy strict articulation; they are inextricably mixed up chronologically; they are like "beads upon a string;" but all of them contain what may be classified as apothegms or paradigms, sayings, parables, tales, historical narratives, legends, etc., if such terms are useful in determining ultimate origins, which is doubtful. But has this literary form ever raised the question of their substantial historical and biographical character? No. There is no valid reason why it should do so in the gospel records, although the element of interpretation is more pronounced in them, which is, however, something entirely different from invention.

If there were space for it, one might be tempted to draw a parallel between the biography and history of Jeremiah and that of Jesus: the figurative form of the call, the Temple discourse, the aroused antagonism, persecution and death, etc. The Hebrews had a genius for biography and history, exercised to the beginning of the Christian era. We can only surmise in what manner

the records of the "writing" prophets took their first written form and how they were preserved and transmitted, but we know it was done. With the appearance of Jesus came a revival of prophetism; and with it, we may reasonably assume, came a revival of the interest in and technique of prophetic biography and history. To declare as Form Critics do that the early disciples of Jesus expected the end of the age and had no interest in history, may be true of a group; but it was not true of all. If it were true of all, we should have no gospel records whatever: and Luke's "many" who had attempted gospel accounts could not have existed. To say, as Dibelius¹² does, that the disciples were "fishermen, tax gatherers, perhaps also farm-laborers, unfamiliar with the literary practices of the world" sounds strangely out of place; for Amos was a farmer, Jesus a carpenter, and Paul a tent-maker; and the Jews of the first century insisted that every boy learn a trade.¹³ It is true enough that the oral gospel preceded the written gospel, which is nothing new in gospel criticism, and that preaching was the first way of telling the gospel story. But the preaching consisted of facts of history, accounts of the life and teachings of Jesus, told, indeed, with the background of the Christian preachers' experience; but not invented to suit the object of Christian propaganda. The Jesus of history became the Christ of faith; and not the Christ of faith the Jesus of history. The denial of biography in the gospel records becomes almost amusing when it leads to the omission of one of the best authentic miracles of Jesus, the healing of Peter's wife's mother. Mark's realism makes the cure caused by personal and psychic contact: "He grasped her hand," with the implication that he pulled her up; "and the fever left her." But Dibelius has no room for it; evidently because the mother-in-law element is too biographical. Lightfoot follows suit, with a quotation from Wellhausen to the effect that it is suspicious.¹⁴

¹⁰In the article mentioned above, pp. 13ff.

¹¹In the same number of the *Journal*, article, "God's Continuing Revelation," pp. 3ff.

¹²*Message*, p. 125.

¹³For a full statement of this phase, see *The Validity of the Gospel Record*. E. F. Scott.

¹⁴*Message*, p. 32.

Another reason for disagreement with Form Criticism is that its method is subjective, arbitrary, and inconsistent, leading to the elimination of material that is needed for a consistent picture of the Jesus of history. To illustrate, I select one phase of the trial of Jesus. It belongs to the Passion Narrative which Form Critics regard in its Markan form as the earliest written and most authentic part of the gospel records. For lack of space I reduce my limits still further, namely, to the night session of the Sanhedrin, Mk. 14:53-65. The whole section, except the opening sentence: "And they led Jesus to the palace of the high priest," Dibelius omits as unhistorical.¹⁴ This night session of the Sanhedrin has been recently subjected to a critical analysis, resulting in a considerable amount of literature. It began with the French jurist Juster¹⁵ who denied that the Jews had at the time of Pilate the right of execution of criminals guilty of blasphemy. Professor Hans Lietzmann adopted the view:¹⁶ and argued that the trial of Jesus before the Sanhedrin, with the death penalty for blasphemy, was unhistorical. Dibelius follows him:¹⁷ and so does Lightfoot¹⁸ who makes the admission that he "constantly followed Professor Lietzmann closely." Rejecting the night session as unhistorical, Professor Lightfoot disposes of it, in characteristic Form Criticism fashion, as a later invention, grown out of "the developing convictions of the church and the treatment it had received from the Jews by the time at which this story may have taken shape. . . ." Lietzmann¹⁹ had discarded the night session because there was "no reliable source for it." Lightfoot²⁰ does not consider this

"an insuperable difficulty;" but objects to it on account of "the unlikelihood of a night session at all." But what is to Lietzmann the real insuperable difficulty in the night session is its content, namely, the testimony of Jesus which he could not have given according to Lietzmann: "I will destroy this temple, made with hands, and in three days will build another, made without hands," because it is inconsistent with his recent cleansing of the temple; and Lightfoot agrees with him. But there is no inconsistency, the temple was sacred while it stood, irrespective of what might ultimately become of it. Both critics regard Stephen as the originator of the saying. "The saying," says Lietzmann, "contrasts the risen Jesus as master of the new life with the powerless Mosaic law, as John 2: 19-22, correctly interprets it: it breathes the spirit of the converted Hellinists of the type of Stephen who according to Acts 6:14 questions in such a sense the significance of the temple cult." The saying was thus "transferred to Jesus who thus becomes the prototype of Stephen." Dibelius, on the contrary, says: "Such a saying must have circulated in the tradition. . . . For this vouches the martyr story of Stephen and certainly the gospel of John." With whom then the priority of the saying lies is among Form Critics a subjective judgment.

But the matter lies deeper. Of the four accusations brought forth at the trial of Jesus, this saying concerning the temple is the most significant and historical, although somewhat veiled. It stamps him as the prophet, the exponent of spiritual religion. It reminds us of a similar saying with similar consequences. It was Jeremiah who had said in his famous temple discourse: "Therefore will I do unto the house which is called by my name . . . as I did to Shiloh" (7:14), for which he was tried and condemned to death for blasphemy. It accounts more reasonably for the death penalty for blasphemy of Jesus than any other; and

¹⁵*Le Juifs dans l'empire romain*. 1-2. Paris 1914.

¹⁶*Der Prozess Jesu*. Sitzungsberichte der Preussischen Akademie der Wissenschaft, Berlin, 1931, pp. 313-322.

¹⁷*Neutestamentliche Zeitschrift*, 1931.

¹⁸*History and Interpretation in the Gospels*, pp. 126ff.

¹⁹*Ibid.*, p. 315.

²⁰*Ibid.*, p. 143.

meets exactly with the requirement. It accounts for the opposition of the Pharisees; the death of Stephen; the early zealous antagonism of Paul; for his conversion, when the Pharisee is converted to the Prophet of Nazareth; for the accompanying call to his mission to the Gentiles; for his persistent anti-nomism carried through the two greatest of his epistles; and for his own persecutions and his death. It is in this manner we can find sufficient objective data for the historical character of Jesus' trial at the night session of the Sanhedrin and his condemnation to death for blasphemy, although this does not imply that the account did not receive a touch of interpretation from the experience of the church. When thus probed, the excision of the night session is due to the view of Form Criticism that Jesus was a Pharisee and scribe and not a prophet.

Space is lacking for an account of a new type of gospel criticism that has made considerable progress in Germany, although it has not been heard of in this country. It is based on Siever's Tone Analysis, accord-

ing to which every person normally has a rhythm in speaking as individualistic as his finger prints or face. Those who have trained themselves to detecting it can distinguish the "voices" in a document. In the pursuit of these investigations, the critics go back to the original Aramaic, and make use of the achievements in Aramaic lore of Torrey, Burney, Dalman, Littmann and others. The subtlety of the data involved is a handicap; and it is not likely to become as popular as Form Criticism. Associated with the tone analysis is the psychological approach in exegesis. A notable contribution to this new type of criticism and exegesis is a commentary on Mark.²¹ It is in striking contrast with Form Criticism, critical but not hypercritical; positive rather than negative; conserving every item of historical and biographical data. When Form Criticism will have had its day and have gone the way the myth theory and "consistent eschatology" have gone, the new criticism may have a flurry too. All of these attempts help a little, so we are willing to let them have their day. Form Criticism will leave behind its contribution that the gospel records are biography and history mingled with Christian experience; and that will be a gain well worth the effort.

²¹*Das Evangelion nach Markos. Psychologisch dargestellt von Fery Freiherr von Edelsheim mit einem Anhang: Schallanalytische Auswertung des Marcus-Evangelium von Prof. Dr. E. Sievers, Leipzig, 1931.*

A Note on Dr. Peritz's Article

FREDERICK C. GRANT

IT MUST be that I did not make my point clear enough. I was speaking of the records, not of the character or office of Jesus: "They are not stenographic or phonographic records, of course, nor did Jesus or his immediate disciples write journals, memorabilia, or letters. But they are precisely the kind of record Jewish teaching received in that age, and are much earlier in date than the records of other Jewish teachers and leaders—Hillel, for example, or Gamaliel, or Akiba. And their value, for religious life and faith today, is precisely as great as it has ever been." (JBR VII.1, Feb. 1939, p. 10, col. a).

Personally I agree with Dr. Peritz that Jesus was a Prophet, not a Rabbi—indeed, the title "rabbi" does not seem to have been common before the period after the Fall of Jerusalem and the reorganization of the Jewish schools. The suggestion of Dr. Samuel Cohon of Cincinnati (JBL XLVIII. 1-2, 1929, pp. 82-108) that Jesus was a Hasid of the Am-ha-aretz, like that of the late Rudolf Otto of Marburg (in his *Kingdom of God and Son of Man*) that Jesus was an "*ober galiliyya*, a Galilean itinerant:" "*ein galiläischer Wanderprediger und Wunderarzt*"—neither of these conceptions springs from the study of form criticism, yet both certainly presuppose an element of free, direct inspiration more akin to prophecy than to the scholastic learning and teaching of the rabbis. Perhaps it was a form prophetic inspiration had to take, in the days following the close of the Canon: prophecy was now domesticated, restrained, driven down among the people, and no longer the "spiritual statesmanship" of an Amos or an Isaiah. The ethos of the time was different. National independence had been all but lost,

for one thing; and that made an enormous difference. But it was certainly a type of religious leadership and teaching far removed from the expositions and debates of the schools. I myself think Cohon and Otto are both far nearer the truth than either the description of Jesus as a rabbi or, on the other hand, the unqualified, undefined ascription to him of the rôle of prophet. In the eighth century B. C. he would no doubt have been a prophet; but the first century was another and a different world. It is little use citing John Baptist as a first century "prophet;" we know too little about him; the records of his work scarcely compare with those left behind by Amos, Hosea, Micah, not to mention Isaiah or Jeremiah. He seems to have been a preacher with but one message: "Repent, before the great and terrible Day of the Lord." Jesus, on the other hand, was really a prophet, so far as prophecy could be exercised under the circumstances of his day; but he was also more than a prophet—he was in some sense the *bearer* not only of the message of the Kingdom but of its realization. As Dibelius says in his latest book (*Jesus*, in *Sammlung Götschen* 1130, ch. vi), Jesus and his disciples were themselves the "Sign" of the Kingdom's arrival. The Kingdom had already begun to be realized; there is surely this much truth—and perhaps more—in Dodd's contention. Hence a further qualification of the term "prophet" is required: at the least, he was a new and different kind of prophet from any who had gone before.

(As far as doctrinal Christology goes, is there any reason why the Incarnation should not have taken place thus, in one who was a prophet—and more than a prophet!—rather than in a Messiah who never realized,

perhaps never aimed to realize, the very thing Messiahship stood for, first, last, and always, viz. an earthly reign? As it seems to me, the popular equation, Jesus=Messiah, is totally inadequate to the facts as they can be made out from the earliest evangelic traditions. Here is something far more than Messiahship)!

But where does Dr. Peritz get the idea that I would describe our Lord as a Rabbi? To go back to the passage quoted above from my JBR paper, which he cites at the beginning of his article, this was no more than a statement of the kind of records the New Testament contains, without implying anything as to Jesus' character or office. Indeed, it is no more than the late Canon Streeter—no form critic!—said in the latest preface to his *Four Gospels* (1930, p. xiii), in rebutting the charge that his "proto-Luke" was an "amorphous" document:

"The objection overlooks the fact that the Jews were not in the habit of writing the biographies of Prophets or Rabbis; they preserved sayings and parables, interspersed with a few incidents, with the smallest attempt at systematic arrangement. 'Amorphous' would be a most appropriate adjective to describe the book of Jeremiah (the Prophet about whom we have most information) or the traditions about the Jewish Rabbis which were written down some little time after the Christian Era."

Incidentally, Streeter would not appear to agree with Dr. Peritz, who says, "The Hebrews had a genius for biography and history, exercised to the beginning of the Christian era." Streeter, I think, is more securely within the facts: "The Jews were not in the habit of writing the biographies of Prophets or Rabbis...." I agree with Streeter, and can accept Dr. Peritz's statement only in the broad sense that Hebrew and Jewish religion was fundamentally historical in outlook. What Dr. Peritz says of the structure or arrangement—or lack of it—in the prophetic writings, and the analogy with the gospel materials, and also

what he says of the influence of the Elijah and Elisha cycles upon the evangelic tradition (see Dr. Goodspeed's *Introduction*, pp. 125 ff)—this is sound and is also good form criticism! But I think an equally close analogy is the rabbinic tradition, as a glance at the first volume of Wilhelm Bacher's *Agada der Tannaiten* must make clear. Here were scattered traditions of various types; e.g., under Akiba: Sentences, characteristic utterances; polemical and apologetic sayings; expositions of the Law, and rules of exegesis; homiletic passages and sayings; eschatological; and so on. But the main difference, apart from content, between the rabbinic traditions and both the evangelic and the earlier prophetic is that the rabbinic traditions were never collected, edited, arranged "biographically" or otherwise, and fashioned into separate, distinct works. The analogy exists only with the gospel materials, the oral traditions, of course not with the finished "gospels." As Professor Riddle notes in his new book, *The Gospels, Their Origin and Growth*, Judaism, or Jewish Christianity, would never have produced gospels (pp. 76, 109).

There are some other points that might be discussed in Dr. Peritz's friendly critique.

1. I am sure not many form critics would subscribe to the parallel between Jesus and Hillel. They were somewhat alike in spirit—Dr. Sanday used to cite the *mitis sapientia* of Hillel and quote the saying that "his gentleness brought men 'nigh under the wings of the Shekinah'" (*Outlines*, p. 19). But in point of view, aim, presuppositions, and the content of their teaching they were certainly far more unlike than alike.

2. It is difficult to see how form criticism *could* possibly hold that the "antinomistic" teachings of Jesus must be "excised"; as far as I am aware, form criticism does not attempt to do this. True, the representation of the teaching of Jesus

as we read it in the Gospel of Matthew, i.e. as the new, supplemental, perfected Torah, goes far beyond what Jesus actually taught. So do the acerbities of the anti-pharisaic discourse in ch. 23. But this is no special contribution of form criticism: almost everyone now recognizes the development that has taken place. Jesus' criticism and reinterpretation of the Law is still seen to be one of the basic elements in his message. As the varied nuances of contemporary Pharisaism become more sharply defined, thanks to such writers as Branscomb, Finkelstein, Montefiore, and Loewe, the setting of Jesus' criticisms and interpretations of the Torah becomes all the more vivid, and also the way in which that setting has been altered and modified either in the Christian oral tradition or by the editors of this tradition who wrote the gospels: for example the Corban-saying, the Sabbath controversies, the question about fasting, and the criticism of the dietary regulations. I do not believe the form critics are inclined to excise this element in Jesus' teaching; on the contrary it is retained and given a far clearer and more convincing exposition than it has ever received hitherto.

3. As to a "revival of the interest and technique of prophetic biography and history" following the appearance of Jesus and the "revival of prophetism," I regret that I cannot understand what is meant. The only Jewish biography of the first century I can think of is Josephus' *Vita*; but that was mainly an *apologia pro vita sua*, not really a biography or autobiography—his life was in danger and he had to defend his record. Or are Christian biographies in mind? Where are they? Surely the Gospels are not biographies; and where are any biographies of the other leaders in the Christian movement—Peter and Paul and James the Lord's brother? Anecdotes we have, as in the traditions of other Jews of the first century; but biographies—?

4. The problem of the Sanhedrin's night session is not fully stated by Dr. Peritz. True, the competence of the Council is part of the issue, and so is the legality of such a "trial" as the gospels describe. Further, it is a question if the words about the temple can be accurately reported (Mark 14:58—where the current text may be influenced by later exegesis), or may not indeed be influenced by the story of Stephen. The improbability of any official record of this "trial" is very great; though it would surely have been easy enough for some verbal report of it to have leaked out and so have come into the hands of Jesus' followers. But why was this threat against the temple not made the basis of a charge before Pilate? That is difficult to understand, and is scarcely explained by the failure of the witnesses to agree (vs. 59). If even two witnesses had brought the charge—and verse 57 is certainly plural—it could have been used.

But the real crux of the problem is in vv. 61b-64, where Jesus is made to affirm openly and unequivocally, as nowhere else in the whole of the synoptic tradition, his own identity with the coming Judge, "the Son of Man sitting at the right hand of Power and coming with the clouds of heaven." Though he is condemned for this "blasphemy," no use is made of this claim, either, before Pilate: there he is evidently accused of claiming to be "the king of the Jews," something entirely different. How could the claim to be "the Son of Man" of Daniel's vision be interpreted as a claim to earthly royalty, with its implication of political activity and potential insurrection? Moreover, it seems improbable that either claim would be viewed by a Jewish court as "blasphemy." That is the problem, not posed by form criticism but by any historical study of the gospels, but more adequately solved, I believe, by form criticism than by any other proposed explanation. What we have here is the crown and climax of

the whole Marcan thesis, viz. Jesus was already identified with the Son of Man, not after his death but during his lifetime; hence, though he walked this earth almost incognito, foregleams of his celestial destiny broke through from time to time; and eventually, on the very eve of his crucifixion, he himself explicitly and unequivocally confessed his secret. Mark 14:61b-64 is all of a piece with the interpretative additions and editings of the primitive tradition which we find throughout that gospel—the brightest, most dramatic bit of them all. What it tells us is the place Christ held in the faith and devotion of Mark and his fellow-believers, rather than what

took place one night in the high priest's house at Jerusalem.—But I do not believe the “excision” of these verses by form critics, and by other critics as well, is “due to the view of form criticism that Jesus was a Pharisee and scribe and not a prophet.”

5. As for *Schallanalyse*, “tone analysis,” I regret I cannot share my friend Dr. Peritz's optimism. That, rather than form criticism (or, as I would prefer, *tradition criticism*), seems to me altogether too subjective a method of research. There may be more to it than I suspect; but the proof must lie in further results, not in discussion of theory.

More Form Criticism

MARY E. ANDREWS

I HAVE READ again my review of Professor Grant's translation of Dibelius' *Die Botschaft von Jesus Christus*. I see there a highly appreciative statement of a useful and significant contribution, but that *any* book *settles* the problem with which it deals is an opinion that I would not voice. The student with a sense of perspective in any field simply does not make such assumptions. The person who knows something of the history of the interpretation and criticism of the New Testament would not dare assume such finality. I do welcome the newer gospel research, I hope from the same motive that I would welcome fresh insights in any field of interest and I trust that the critical judgment of scholars in any area will tone down the excesses of the over-enthusiastic pioneer when they lead to too extreme positions. I agree with practically every Form Critic that Jesus was not a rabbi.

Professor Grant has answered most of Professor Peritz's statements relative to the

gospels, but there are a few other observations that I would add. 1) I am unable to share Dr. Peritz's attitude on the Jewish view of Jesus. Before I knew that Form Criticism existed I was using with pleasure and profit such books as Montefiore's *Synoptic Gospels*, an indispensable background for Christian students who are prone to think that Jesus invented the Golden Rule, that the Lord's prayer has no connection with Judaism and that Christianity represents a brand new ethic. 2) If I read Paul aright he was not converted to the “Prophet of Nazareth,” but to the Son of God (Gal. 1:16) whose death and resurrection had put him in the place of power with God, and who was the coming Apocalyptic Messiah (1 Thess. 1:10, 4:14-16); 1 Cor. 15:22-28, 51-52). 3) While Pauline Christianity is not the whole of early Christianity, in that area at least I see no evidence that would point to the recounting of the life and teaching of Jesus as part of the earliest Christian preaching. Paul's emphasis

was on the crucified and risen Christ, who is to come to earth in Messianic splendor, on the Spirit (of God, of Christ or simply Spirit; the terms are used interchangeably) as the source of revelation. In one instance Paul seems to appeal to Jesus' teaching on divorce, but in the Corinthian situation involving mixed marriages he was willing to let the unbelieving partner depart. 4) Dr. Peritz quotes Klausner approvingly that Paul's "anti-nomism" demands that of Jesus as forerunner. This is not a *necessary* inference. If Pauline preaching was to be anything more than proselyting for the synagogue he did not dare make joining the Jewish race by circumcision the prerequisite to membership in the Christian cult. This precluded, he works out an elaborate defense of his procedure and substitutes Spirit for Law in the achievement of salvation. 5) Form Criticism applied to Paul's letters has definitely shown that the ethical sections of these, as well as his vice and virtue lists (this recognition antedated Form Criticism) are not as highly original as, say the thirteenth chapter of First Corinthians, but represent rather the Christianization of current ethical teaching such as is found in Stoic and Hellenistic Jewish literature (See Weidinger, *Die Haustafeln* and Ch. I of my *Ethical Teaching of Paul*). Would any one assert that the matchless Phil. 4:4-8 loses by being something which Paul appreciated and borrowed but did not create?

Professor Peritz generously acknowledges that Professor Grant and I do full justice to the prophetic character of Jesus when we are not under the direct influence of Form Criticism. Dr. Grant's reply at that point shows that he does not consider the two things mutually exclusive. I am a bit disconcerted to be under the influence of anything that Dr. Peritz considers subversive in these days of propaganda of all kinds! I have been aware for some years that it is as

easy for a leopard to change his spots, to borrow Jeremiah's vivid figure, as for a person with my educational background to forget the importance of environmental factors in the development of early Christianity. And that brings me to the second part of my contribution to this symposium, namely, a review of Professor Riddle's new book, *The Gospels, Their Origin and Growth*.¹

Dr. Peritz protests a statement from Professor Riddle's earlier book, *Jesus and the Pharisees* (1928) p. 177, where the author asserts the impossibility of the conflicts with the Pharisees having occurred *as they are described* (italics mine), but he does find place for such conflicts in the experience of Christian leaders and groups in the developing Christian movement. I have read the chapter of conclusions of this earlier book and consulted the index under various subjects. Professor Riddle does not see Jesus as a rabbi, although he finds him "to have been a Jewish religious leader who appears in the most lifelike manner, living, working and teaching" (p. 171). Perhaps this can only mean rabbi, but that would be reading between the lines. At any rate on page 13 of the new book it is distinctly stated: "He had lived a significant life as a Jew, and, although he was not a professional leader, he achieved such distinctive values in his religious life that he had impressed his associates as a notable person."

In his Preface Professor Riddle states as the purpose of his book "to provide, in a simple untechnical form, the story of the origin and growth of the gospels as the processes are understood from the modern point of view." He has not discussed the bearing of modern gospel study on the problems of the life of Jesus; this requires a study devoted to that subject alone. This second book, as yet unwritten, will be the measuring rod, working unconsciously in many minds which will decide the validity of the contentions of the first. In all probability portraits of Jesus, whether the "liber-

¹University of Chicago Press, 1939. ix plus 293 pages, \$3.00.

al" Jesus, the consistent eschatologist, the social reformer, yes, even the "prophet-Jesus" or any other favorite form in which Jesus has been delineated will step between the reader and Professor Riddle's portrayal and help to determine that reader's conception of the validity of the picture of the processes of the growth of the gospel which he has depicted with such persuasiveness, every page revealing sure mastery over the materials he is shaping into these new molds. It is a fascinating story that this book unfolds in simple language making available for those who read only English and who flounder in the technicalities of scholarship the newer researches in the field of the gospel literature. It is a book of which American scholarship has a right to be proud and its dedication to Professor Grant is especially fitting in the light of the latter's contributions to making this method of gospel research at home among American students of the New Testament.

The story moves logically and swiftly. The chapters are brief, but trenchant. From the period when there were no gospels to the time when throughout the world four gospels functioned as the voice of the church the reader's interest is sustained. The early Christian message of the resurrection and the appearances of Jesus to individuals and to groups existed orally at first and received its first summary in Paul. This was the gospel, and it meant different things to Jews and to Gentiles which resulted in the adaptation of early preaching to the needs of the hearers.

The stories about Jesus and the sayings attributed to him grew into the gospels; the various evangelists used this material and shaped it according to the various purposes of each. Different materials appealed to different groups. Gentiles would revel in the stories of Jesus' birth, his healings and exorcisms. Professor Riddle makes one statement that will not escape challenge. Relative to exorcism he points out the atti-

tude of Judaism toward the practice of controlling demons by exorcistic formulae. This was forbidden. "This does not prove that it was not done surreptitiously, but in the familiar Judaism of Jesus' day there could not have been any public practice of it by a recognized religious leader" (p. 45). Does he imply that exorcism of demons was no part of Jesus ministry?

"The gospel messages and emerging Christianity grew up together" is the topic sentence of an interesting chapter on the transition of Christianity to the Gentile world which had important effects on the development of the gospel story. One sees anew the significance of Paul who could not have quoted a gospel had he been interested in presenting Jesus' life and "teaching," for there were none to quote. Neither Jewish Christianity nor Pauline Christianity would have produced gospels.

Professor Riddle adduces interesting gospel materials cited by First and Second Clement, papyri materials, etc., which show that stories about Jesus grew luxuriantly. He applies the term "popular" to this tradition which Dibelius has called "wild" tradition. Separate stories were grouped into cycles of various types which were placed and used as individual gospel writers saw fit. A common objection to Form Criticism is that it dissolves the tradition into impossibly small and insignificant units, losing the sense of wholeness. Various source theories have arisen from the two-source theory to those of Burton and Streeter. Mark's imperviousness to minute analysis in the past has been partly due to the feeling of its unity because of the part Peter was thought to have played in its composition according to Papias. This hesitancy no longer holds. A significant commentary (that of Branscomb in the Moffatt series) lists seven sources, possibly more. In this judgment Professor Riddle concurs. The three stages of gospel growth are 1) many stories and sayings 2) gathering of these into blocks

or units of tradition 3) the author's plan. Only the last stage represents the collection of written materials.

The present reviewer would single out the two chapters on Mark as of especial significance. It is not easy to be original on a book about which so much has been written. These chapters have been enriched by the author's earlier research which is embodied in *The Martyrs*, by an appreciation of Roman religion and character and by a keen sense of the needs that this gospel was called upon to meet in a time of deep crisis in the church. Incidentally Professor Riddle sees the natural end of Mark at 16:8 a view now becoming articulate with a number of modern scholars.

Two chapters "The Gospel and the Church" and "The Growth of a Christian Consciousness" introduce us to further gospel materials that eventually crystallized into the favorite gospel of the church, Matthew.

Professor Riddle insists on the necessity of viewing Luke-Acts as a whole, recognizing the invaluable work of Professor Cadbury along this line. He sees Luke-Acts as literature of defense, a view not new with him here, but brought into vital connection with the whole story he is here recounting.

The Gospel of John finds its place in two chapters on Hellenistic Mysticism. Its purpose was to supplant the other gospels. No crisis called it forth but only the desire for

a gospel congenial to Greek minds. It was a new voice.

Particularly significant in this study too, in addition to the chapter on pre-gospel materials is a chapter dealing with gospels in addition to the Great Four. As in his last book, *Early Christian Life*, here too he refuses to set the New Testament apart from all other early Christian literature, but insists on viewing the early Christian literary materials as a whole even to an account of Popular Gospels for Minority Groups.

An author's notes are revealing. Professor Riddle is a true son of Chicago but there is nothing parochial about his book. He cites significant work of his former teachers, to be sure, as well as his own previous research, but primary source material and the work of outstanding contemporaries point to a grasp of the important literature bearing on this field that should inspire confidence in those who, thus far, have been uneasy about the results of the newer research on the gospels. Among German scholars Professor Dibelius has had much more influence on Professor Riddle than has Professor Bultmann.

As with Dibelius' *Botschaft* in Dr. Grant's translation I am glad for another simple, untechnical presentation of the results of the method of Form Criticism for the general reader. *And one may have the keenest satisfaction in any given book without assuming its finality.*

The Reformer Meets A Taoist

— JOHN DE YOUNG

(Instructor's Note: In teaching the History of Religion there is a particular danger that the student may learn about "streams" and "movements," without picturing the living historical human beings who prayed these prayers, worshipped these deities, and revered these scriptures which we are studying centuries later. One way in which to stimulate the translating of abstract trends into personal terms is to assign the writing of short plays or dialogues. This may be particularly valuable when *contacts between two religions* are being studied, lest the students forget that it was in *individuals* that the religions met.

In a Comparative Religion course at Beloit College, plays were written in connection with the study of several such contact periods. One, dealing with the coming of Buddhism to China, pictures a conversation between a supercilious Confucian scholar and a Buddhist missionary who has just come from India. The scholar is very scornful and insists that China has no place for such foolish supernaturalism, but an old woman whose son has just died comes by and listens with grateful eagerness to the missionary's message. Another play, printed here, was written for an assignment on the paradoxical Taoist "non-action" and its relation to Confucian ethics.

TERESINA ROWELL)

Place:

We are on the summit of a mountain in China looking down into a valley. Far below is a city torn asunder with hatred and fear. Two men are watching. One is calm, tranquil, aloof. The other is restless. He paces to and fro. His eyes flash. His breath is fast and short. Suddenly he stops, turns to his companion.

The Reformer: Soon it will be over. None will remain but you and I. Then will come the new people. They will know nothing but what we will give them. We, you and I, have the power to build a new nation, a new people.

Taoist Sage: What will you teach them, my friend?

Reformer: I will build a vast new nation. I will teach my people how to live. Justice and law will be established. Righteousness will be my watchword. I will build roads, bridges. My people shall live in comfort never before known. I will teach them to live in harmony with one another. Each will have his duty to his neighbor. All will be students, knowledge will reign.

Taoist: But is that not the life down there that is dying?

Reformer: Down there is dirt and suffering. Greed and envy are running wild.

Brother is killing brother, sons are killing fathers. I will have peace. Crime will be punished. Righteousness, justice, filial piety, paternal affection will be promoted.

Taoist: How, my friend? You would make righteousness a creative spirit. You would teach filial piety. But virtue, righteousness, filial piety were never heard of until the world had fallen into disorder. Is not the only hope of the world to dispense with all of these artificial attempts and return to the simple life?

Reformer: A world without knowledge, law, justice? They would be nothing but savages.

Taoist: Savages? I wonder. In the days when natural instincts prevailed, men moved quietly and gazed steadily. There were no roads over the mountains, nor bridges over water. There was no knowledge, but all being without it, none could go astray. There were no distinctions of good and bad, hence there was no need of justice. Man was in a state of natural integrity, hence there was no need of law. Then came the sage, the teacher, tripping people with "charity," with justice, fettering

(Concluded on Page 198)

Light From North Syria on Old Testament Interpretation

LOUISE PETTIBONE SMITH

WITHIN the last ten years, archæology has brought to the student of the Old Testament a series of documents from Ras Shamra in North Syria, which in their importance rank with the tablets of Tell-el-Amarna and the papyri of Elephantine.

Accounts of the excavations, magnificently illustrated, can be found in the volumes of *Syria*, 1928-39,¹ which also gives the text of many of the tablets with translation and commentary. Articles, notes, and discussions of specific problems are to be found in a dozen or more periodicals, English, French and German, and there are various editions of transliterated texts, including one with a translation into modern Hebrew.

For the non-specialist, two general accounts are available, one by J. W. Jack, the other by René Dussaud.² Since Mr. Jack is perhaps unduly sceptical of the value of the texts for Old Testament interpretation, and M. Dussaud somewhat over-confident, the two books may serve to balance each other. An interesting use of the material is made in Graham and May's *Culture and Conscience*.

Ras Shamra (Fennel Head) is a mound about eight miles north of the ancient Laodicea and directly across from the tip of the island of Cyprus. There are two groups of ruins, less than half a mile apart—Minet-el-Beida (White Harbor) directly on the coast and Ras Shamra proper.³ In 1928 a

peasant digging in his field found stone slabs covering an ancient tomb. This was reported to the authorities and the next year excavating was begun.

The excavators found five clearly defined layers, the earliest neolithic. The most important, the second from the top, dates probably 2100-1400 B. C. At this time the city was an important centre of west Asiatic commerce. Its name, Ugarit, appears several times in the Tell-el-Amarna letters. The chief exports were ukarinna wood, copper and bronze utensils and weapons, and horses. The wealthy merchants built themselves elaborate houses. Dussaud gives the plan of one which shows twelve rooms on the ground floor and a stair case leading to an upper story. Jewellery was plentiful and elaborate.

From this period two temples have been excavated. In one was found a votive tablet with an Egyptian inscription "To Baal-Sapon in behalf of the royal scribe and keeper of the house of silver";⁴ in the other, two steles dedicated to Dagon.⁵

But the purely archeological discoveries, however interesting, are not more striking than those at other sites in Syria and Palestine. The unique importance of Ras Shamra is due to the amount of written material which the site has yielded. The people of Ugarit, like the Babylonians and Assyrians, wrote with a stylus on clay tablets, and the excavators uncovered a room which had evidently been used for storing these tablets. In addition to the tablets in the "library," many other fragments turned up in other places; some had even been used in repairing a wall. These tablets belong

¹Cf. also the *Illustrated London News*.

²Jack, J. W., *The Ras Shamra Tablets: Their Bearing on the Old Testament*. T. & T. Clark, 1953. Dussaud, René, *Les Découvertes de Ras Shamra et l'Ancien Testament*. Paris, 1937.

³*Syria* 1928, p. 16.

⁴*Syria* 1931, p. 10 and plate VI.

⁵*Syria* 1935, p. 177.

to the latter part of layer II, and date from 1500-1350.⁶

At this time Ugarit was inhabited by a mixed population, mostly West-Semitic, but including also Egyptians, Babylonians, Hittites, Cypriotes and Hurrians. Some of the tablets were in Akkadian, a few in the old Sumerian, but most of them were written in a character previously unknown. Since no bi-lingual tablet or inscription was found, decipherment was difficult.

Since there are only 30 different signs, the cuneiform, unlike that of Babylon and Assyria, was obviously alphabetic. The identification of the characters was practically accomplished within a year. One of the three pioneers, P. Dhorme, had been decorated by his government for his work on ciphers during the World War. No entirely satisfactory theory of the origin of this alphabet has been offered, perhaps the signs were chosen at random. There are more letters than in Hebrew or Phoenician, fewer than in Arabic. The *aleph* has three forms, according to the vowel pronounced with it, otherwise the vowels are not indicated.

The smaller tablets are of all kinds: lists of officials, lists of sacrifices, lists of people, contracts, letters, directions for treating sick horses. One letter translated by Prof. Albright,⁷ is the request for the extradition of a run-away groom—additional evidence for the importance of horses in the economic life of the city. The shortest letter may perhaps be translated:

"Furnish drink to the priests, men and asses;

⁶*Jewish Quarterly Review*, October, 1938.

⁷*Bulletin American Schools Oriental Research* No. 63, p. 24.

⁸Dussaud, *op. cit.*, p. 55. Bauer, Hans *Die Alphabetischen Keil schrifttexte von Ras Shamra*, No. 59.

⁹BASOR No. 52, p. 5; cf. No. 53, p. 18.

Furnish drink to the holy ones, men and asses."⁸

One short inscription in this alphabet but written backwards has been found in Palestine at Beth Shemesh. Prof. G. A. Barton's tentative translation runs "O El, cut through the backbone of my stammering. I desire that thou shalt remove the spring of my impediment."⁹

Most significant are the mythological texts, probably a part of the temple archives. The longest of these has eight columns, 40-50 lines to a column. Several others are half this length.

Although the value of all but one or two of the signs is definitely known, and although the tablets were carefully written with the word division marked, translation is often difficult, if not impossible.

The language, although very like Biblical Hebrew, is a distinct dialect; the mixed population means a mixed vocabulary (many words are apparently Hurrian and several tablets are in the Hurrian language); and the absence of vowels leaves many forms ambiguous. For instance, the consonants k-l-b can be equally the Hebrew word for *dog*, or the preposition *like* and the word *heart*; consequently in early translations of the same two lines we find

"Anat overtook the dog who hunted her calf

The dog who pursued her lamb"

or

"As the heart of a cow for her calf
As the heart of a ewe for her lamb
So was the heart of Anat."

However, since the texts employ parallelism as does the Old Testament, one-half of a couplet often clears up an ambiguity in the other half; and, as new texts are published, more and more alternatives are ruled out, so that more and more words are identified without possibility of error.

Of course, sometimes new texts create

difficulties instead of solving them. G-r had been equated with "mountain" until a line appeared in which somebody carried a g-r "in his two hands."¹⁰ P-d-r is usually translated "city," but a passage turned up in which "city" makes nonsense, and we are asked to choose between "battle-ax" and "full-grown mountain goat."

In general the content of the longer texts has been determined. Two long poems deal primarily with the God Aleyan Baal; connected with these is a shorter poem called by the translators "Baal and Koser" or "Baal and the Waters;" another "The Hunting of Baal;" and two, more recently published, where Anat is the chief character.

There is also a short poem "The Birth of the Gracious Gods," and one called "The Graces" or "A Hymn to Nikal." Besides these there are two long poems first published in book form, "Keret" and "Danel."

The first poem published, with a few fragments found later, gives the account of the death of Aleyan Baal, of Anat's grief for him, and of the descent of Sepes, the sun-goddess into the underworld from which Aleyan Baal is brought on the shoulders of Anat. The general outline is clear, and several sections are entirely coherent.

AB sup. 7. Let us go down in the earth to him.

She went down, the light of the gods, the Sun.

Again she (Anat) was satisfied with weeping;

She drank her tears like wine.

Then she cried to the Sun, light of the gods,

Lift up for me Aleyan Baal.

The Sun, the light of the gods, hearkened;

She lifted Aleyan Baal on the shoulder of Anat.

When she raised him, she brought him up

To the heights of the North.

Then follows the burial and huge sacrifices offered by Anat, 70 sheep, 70 rams (or stags), 70 mountain goats, 70 deer (or asses).

A I 7. Then (Anat) set her face towards El

The sources of the rivers,

The centre of the streams of the abysses. (cf. Gen. 1:2)

She left the field of El,

She entered the abode of the king, the father of years, (cf. Dan. 7:9 and Enoch 46:1, 2)

At the feet of El she bowed down, she fell prostrate

She bowed herself down and did him honor,

She lifted up her voice and cried. Asherat—she rejoiced and her sons, The goddess and the troop of her attendants,

Because Aleyan Ba'al is dead

Because Zebul, Ba'al of the land, has perished.

Then El cried to the lady, Asherat of the Sea,

"Hear, O Lady, Asherat of the Sea Give one of thy sons, I will make him king."

Then Asherat of the Sea answered No!¹¹

Let us make king one who knows y-l-h-n. The next lines offer various possibilities, none of them satisfactory, but finally Athtar is made king and goes off to the heights of the North to sit on the throne of Baal, and "he ruled over the land of El, all of it."

A contest between Anat and Mot fol-

¹⁰Syria, 1937, p. 269.

¹¹Or possibly "Yes."

lows; again many details are uncertain but the end is unmistakable:

With a sword she clave him,
With a sieve she winnowed him,
With fire she burned him,
With mill-stones she ground him,
On the field she sowed him.
His flesh let the birds eat.
His fragments let the (jackals?) destroy.

The remainder of the poem is confused. Anat apparently dries up all the fields, but another section describes a vision in which "the heavens rain down oil; the brooks flow honey" because Aleyan Baal lives.

The longest of the poems in the Aleyan Baal cycle (cf. *Syria*, 1932) has been translated into English by Prof. G. A. Barton;¹² but although many short sections are intelligible, the course of the narrative as a whole, in spite of Prof. Barton's ingenuity as a translator, is elusive.

A large part of it deals with the building of a temple for Aleyan Baal, and especially with the question of whether or not this temple is to have a window—a question which occupies somewhat more than a hundred lines before it is decided in the affirmative. Probably the poem is best interpreted as part of a fertility ritual dramatized in the temple worship (the window symbolizing the outlet for the much needed rain.) Then, "let us sing our song" (VII: 39) is a sort of stage direction, as is V:104 which is carefully separated from the context by straight lines and apparently reads "turn to the passage 'as you send young men.'" For this usage Gaster cites Egyptian parallels. Was the Judean prophet thinking of some such fertility ritual when he wrote (Jer. 14:22) "Are there any among the vanities of the nations that can cause rain?"

The "hymn to Nikal" beginning

¹²*Jour. Am. Or. Soc.* 1935. *Archaeology and the Bible*, ed. 1933, p. 537.

¹³*Basor* No. 65, pp. 29ff.

¹⁴*Journal Royal Asiatic Society*.

"I sing Nikal and glorify Harhab, king of Summer" (cf. Am. 8:1) is an interesting example of the progressive character of the work of translation. It was published by Virolleaud in *Syria*, 1936. Nikal appears as the son-in-law of the moon-god who is to shine on all who enter the house of the moon. In return for a payment of silver and gold, fields will become vineyards. In February, 1937,¹³ Dr. Cyrus Gordon, by recognizing certain words as related to *mohar* bride-price (Gen. 34:12) and the Assyrian *terhatu* restored Nikal to her proper sex and position. She is the maiden whom the moon-god is seeking in marriage. In I:16 he pays the *mohar* and the *terhatu* to her father who in turn gives his daughter a dowry and a parting-gift (cf. I Ki. 9:16 and Mi. 1:14). Finally in January, 1938,¹⁴ Gaster gave a complete translation which utilized Gordon's suggestions. I quote the final episode:

"Thereafter, then the Moon-god had paid the bride-price for Nikal,
Her father placed a stand for scales in position,
Her mother placed in position the tray of the scales,
Her brother marshalled the witnesses,
Her sisters attended to the weights."

Now what of the new light that all this material throws on the Old Testament? Certainly caution is necessary. The translations, even those most generally agreed upon, are still precarious; any new tablet may give us a new meaning for some word now taken for granted, and that may involve new meanings for several parallel terms.

Many of the proposed identifications with biblical persons, places, etc., have already been abandoned. Ephod and teraphim are no longer found (in AB* I 5, 6). The occurrence of the name

YAHWEH is doubtful. Terah has been eliminated by Prof. Albright.¹⁵

The legend of Keret was first interpreted as giving an account of a campaign in Edom in which Terah, Zebulon and Asher take part, and thus as affording new information on the pre-mosaic history of Palestine. According to Albright,¹⁶ however, Asher becomes a verb "to step":

"They go by thousands, they hasten
And by myriads, like the spawn of fish.
They march, two by two they go.
They march, three by three they go."

Z-b-l-n-m is a common noun, parallel to "skilled craftsman" in the preceding half of the couplet.

Albright's translation of this section of Keret contains an interesting description of the preparation for war:

"Each and all of them, his house is closed
The widow shall hire out her services
The patrician shall carry mattresses
The blind man shall divine by the stars."

And the army

"Like locusts they shall occupy the plain
Like grasshoppers the confines of the
desert."

The likeness to Nahum is obvious. Compare chapter 3:18

"Thy princes are as the locusts
And thy marshals as the swarms of grass-
hoppers."

This sort of close parallel to the Old Testament phrasing is one of the most striking features of the Ras Shamra texts, and

in the present state of our knowledge, this is where the real value for the Old Testament student seems to me to lie.

The form of the poems gives us real help in the difficult problem of Hebrew meter. The parallelism of the poems is more rigid than in much of our present Old Testament text, a fact which suggests the legitimacy of certain emendations. Bauer's¹⁷ transliterated text is printed according to the parallelism, with an astonishing gain in clarity thereby. If Bauer's division of couplets is correct and if we do not need to allow for repetition, the much disputed question of the possibility of the occurrence of verses of three (3:3:3) as well as of two-part lines is answered in the affirmative.

Prof. Obermann¹⁸ suggested that in reading the poems certain phrases written only once were repeated, and he has arranged and translated one of the shorter poems on the assumption that "all Ugarit" was to be repeated with each of the last eight lines. The result is not entirely convincing, but if he is right the theory has important implications for parts of the Psalter.

The tablets offer many verifications and explanations of Old Testament details. The Ugarit talent had 3000 shekels, not like the Babylonian 3600: cf. Ex. 38:25-27, the shekel of the sanctuary. Baal-Zebul seems assured as the correct form of the name of the God of Ekron; one article of jewelry s-b-s-m in the catalogue in Is. 3:18 can be identified as sun-disks pairing with the crescents. Danel, the name of the hero of the Ras Shamra epic, agrees in spelling with the references in Ezekiel against the spelling in the book of Daniel; and it seems highly probable that the reference in Ezekiel 14:14, coupling Danel with Noah and Job, is to the Danel of this poem who

"Under the great trees
Near the threshing-floor
Judges the cause of the widow
Maintains the right of the orphan."¹⁹

¹⁵BASOR No. 71, pp. 36ff.

¹⁶BASOR No. 71, pp. 38ff.

¹⁷Bauer *op. cit. passim*.

¹⁸*Journal Biblical Literature*, 1936.

¹⁹Dussaud, *op. cit.*, p. 90.

Note the similarity to Isaiah 1:23 and Jer. 5:28.

It is possible that in the poem of "Anat and the Heifer," Dussaud is right in finding a legend of the sacred bull, and, since the action apparently takes place in the neighborhood of the lake of Huleh, a legend connected with the bull worship at Dan.

In the "Gracious Gods" the doubtful reference to Ashdod (1.65) can be finally eliminated.²⁰

But much more important is the couplet (1.14)

"Upon the fire, place abundant water
Cook a kid in milk, a lamb in butter"
(Ginsberg's translation)

which offers confirmation of the theory that the prohibition of this rite in the Pentateuch (Ex. 23:19; 34:26; Dt. 14:21) is a repudiation of a Canaanite custom.

The use of two consecutive numbers (cf. Amos, ch. 1 and 2; and Prov. ch. 30) occurs

"Two sacrifices Baal hates
Three the rider of the clouds"
(AB II 3:20)

²⁰Albright BASOR *op. cit.*

Isaiah 27:1, "The Lord with his strong sword shall punish Leviathan, the swift serpent, and Leviathan, the crooked serpent," seems an echo of

"When thou didst smite Leviathan, the
swift serpent,
Didst destroy the crooked serpent,
The mighty one of seven heads"
(AB I:1-3)

Compare also Psalm 74:14, "Thou breakest the heads of Leviathan." It is startling in the hymn to Nikal (1:7) to come upon the exact words—almost the exact syllables—of Isaiah 7:14, "Behold a young woman shall conceive and bear a son."

Such parallels make it abundantly clear that the Old Testament did not come into existence in a literary vacuum. As the translations of the Ras Shamra myths become increasingly reliable, they offer increasingly valuable helps for the understanding of our biblical texts and of some of the influences which affected the development of the religion of Israel.

(Completed June, 1939)

Books Suitable for Use in Undergraduate Courses in the New Testament

ELMER W. K. MOULD

FORASMUCH AS total ignorance of the Bible is what we have to assume in our students, the desideratum in any course of study in the New Testament is that they should read the New Testament. What version shall they read? I tell my students: "The next time you read the Bible, or any part of it, use a version which you have not read before." The form in which the Bible is conventionally printed and bound makes it about as inviting to students as the telephone directory. Therefore the New Testament should be available to them in the attractive make-up of the more recently published Bibles.

VERSIONS

If the King James version be preferred, E. S. Bates' *The Bible Designed to Be Read as Living Literature*¹ is most attractive. *The Aldine Bible—the New Testament*, in four volumes, presents the King James text.² As for the Revised versions, R. G. Moulton's *The Modern Reader's Bible* presents a good arrangement of the N. T., based upon the English Revised text.³ The American Standard version is now in process of re-

vision, and it is greatly to be hoped that, when issued, the publishers will put out an edition in a style as attractive to students as the others here mentioned. Just about the best tools that can be made available for students in any kind of N. T. course are the three modern translations,—Moffatt's, Goodspeed's, and Spencer's. The 1935 edition of Jas. Moffatt's *The Bible, a New Translation* was a thorough revision, regarded by Dr. Moffatt as final.⁴ Various printings are available of E. J. Goodspeed's *The New Testament, an American Translation*;⁵ it is included in *The Bible, an American Translation*; the publishers announce for this autumn *The Complete Bible, an American Translation*, which will comprise the O. T. translation, now edited by Theophile Meek, Dr. Goodspeed's new translation of the Apocrypha, first published in 1938, and, of course, his N. T. *The New Testament of Our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ*, by Fr. Francis A. Spencer,⁶ was extensively reviewed in this Journal by our Editor Emeritus, Dr. Peritz.⁷ Other well known modern translations are R. F. Weymouth's *The New Testament in Modern Speech*;⁸ *The Twentieth Century New Testament*;⁹ and Mrs. H. B. Montgomery's *Centenary Translation of the New Testament*.¹⁰ *The New Testament, a Translation in the Language of the People*, by Chas. B. Williams, 1938, is an attractive book.¹¹ *The New Testament*, Westminster version, in four vols., ed. by Frs. C. Lattey and J. Keating,¹² ought to be available on library reserve for students.

Where the time available for N. T. study is restricted, being only a part of a one-semester course on the whole Bible, an-

¹Simon and Schuster, 1937.

²Vol. I, Matt.-Mk.; Vol. II, Lk.-Jn.; Vol. III, Acts, Rev., Johan. Epis., Pet., Jas., Jude; Vol. IV, Pauline Epis.; Dutton, 1934; reviewed in this Journal (hereinafter referred to as JBR or JNABI), vol. vi, pt. 1, Feb. 1938, p. 63.

³Macmillan.

⁴Harper.

⁵Univ. of Chicago Press.

⁶Macmillan, 1937.

⁷Vol. vi, pt. 1, Winter 1938, pp. 29-34.

⁸Pilgrim Press.

⁹Revell.

¹⁰Am. Bap. Pub. Society, Phila.

¹¹Bruce Humphries.

¹²Longmans, Green, 1927-1938.

thologies of N. T. passages are to be had. In such a situation I have used to good advantage Moulton's *The Modern Reader's Bible for Schools—The New Testament*.¹³ C. F. Kent's *The Shorter Bible, The New Testament*,¹⁴ is of course an original translation. *The Short Bible, an American Translation*, by Goodspeed and Smith,¹⁵ fits splendidly into such a condition. *Century Readings in the New Testament*, ed. by J. W. Cunliffe and H. M. Battenhouse, deserves mention.¹⁶

In a course on the Life of Jesus, a special text of the gospels is desirable, preferably a synopticon. The best available are Burton and Goodspeed's *A Harmony of the Synoptic Gospels*,¹⁷ and Huck's *Synopsis of the First Three Gospels*, arranged for English readers by R. L. Finney.¹⁸ W. E. Bundy's *A Syllabus and Synopsis of the First Three Gospels* is more analytical.¹⁹ Where teachers desire a harmony of all four gospels, A. T. Robertson's *A Harmony of the Gospels for Students of the Life of Christ* is recommended.²⁰ C. C. Torrey's *The Four Gos-*

*pels, a New Translation*²¹ should be available on library reserve.

GENERAL REFERENCE BOOKS

Certain very essential tool books for N. T. study should be available in a college library. There should be a concordance, Cruden's or some other, Bible dictionaries, and sets of commentaries. Specifically to be mentioned are Hastings' *Dictionary of Christ and the Gospels*,²² and Hastings' *Dicmentaries* are, of course, a *sine qua non* for such N. T. courses as consist in the study of particular N. T. books. *The Bible for Home and School* series²⁴ is certainly comprehensible to undergraduates, as are *The Cambridge Bible for Schools and Colleges*, and the *Moffatt New Testament Commentary*,²⁵ which are not filled with extensive critical apparatus that confounds the undergraduate. *The Westminster Commentaries*²⁶ are useful. *The International Critical Commentary*²⁷ is beyond the average undergraduate. Numerous commentaries on N. T. books, not part of any commentary series, many of them very excellent and comprehensible to undergraduates, are available, and would serve N. T. courses which concentrate on specific books; this article cannot be extended to the length of listing them.²⁸ I cannot, however, refrain from citing C. G. Montefiore's *The Synoptic Gospels*, which I hold in the very highest regard.²⁹

The generality of our students are, of course, average. A few, whom I think of as the "academic remnant," are capable of doing a much more scholarly type of work. Bearing both in mind in what follows, I suggest appropriate textbooks for the former, and reference books which may well be placed on library reserve for the latter to use in their wider reading for investigative reports or essays.

¹³Macmillan.

¹⁴Scribner, 1918.

¹⁵Univ. of Chicago Press.

¹⁶Century, 1924.

¹⁷Scribner.

¹⁸Methodist Book Concern.

¹⁹Bobbs-Merrill.

²⁰Doran, 1922.

²¹Harper; rev. JNABI, vol. ii, pt. I (1934), p. 35.

²²Two vols., Scribner, 1906.
tionary of the Apostolic Church.²³ Com-

²³Two vols., Scribner, 1916.

²⁴Macmillan.

²⁵Harper.

²⁶Methuen, London.

²⁷Scribner.

²⁸See the splendid bibliography in E. F. Scott, *The Literature of the New Testament*, Columbia Univ. Press, 1932, pp. 301-303.

²⁹Two vols., Macmillan, 1927.

NEW TESTAMENT HISTORY*

Courses in the N. T. go by a wide variety of names. For a course in N. T. History, strictly so called, the one best book for undergraduates is Shailer Mathews' *New Testament Times in Palestine*.³⁰ Basil Mathews' *The World in Which Jesus Lived*³¹ would serve as an undergraduate text. For wider reading in such a course there should be available in the library:

E. Schürer, *A History of the Jewish People in the Time of Jesus Christ*, 5 vols., Scribner.

W. O. E. Oesterley, *A History of Israel*, vol. ii, Oxford Univ. Press, 1932.

Wm. Fairweather, *The Background of the Gospels*, Scribner, 1926.

T. R. Glover, *The World of the New Testament*, Macmillan, 1931.

F. C. Grant, *The Economic Background of the Gospels*, Oxford Univ. Press, 1926.

NEW TESTAMENT LITERATURE

For a course bearing this title there are several splendid books available for undergraduates. I have used Mary E. Lyman's *The Christian Epic* with great acceptance to my students.³² E. J. Goodspeed's *The Story of the New Testament*³³ is another text which I have found that students like; it has the merit of actually directing them to read the

N. T. E. F. Scott's *The Literature of the New Testament*,³⁴ and H. T. Fowler's *The History and Literature of the New Testament*,³⁵ are of solid merit and, if not used as textbooks, should certainly be available on library reserve. J. H. Snowden's *The Making and Meaning of the New Testament*,³⁶ and H. M. Battenhouse's *New Testament History and Literature*³⁷ were designed as textbooks. M. S. Enslin's *Christian Beginnings*³⁸ is well adapted to guide the student through the books of the N. T. Books which should be available on library reserve are:

D. W. Riddle, *Early Christian Life as Reflected in its Literature*, Willett, Clark, 1936; rev. JBR, vol. v. pt. 2, May 1937, p. 85.

M. Dibelius, *A Fresh Approach to the New Testament and Early Christian Literature*, Scribner, 1936; rev. JBR, vol. v. pt. 2, May 1937, p. 87.

NEW TESTAMENT INTRODUCTION

A course by this title is not likely to be among the offerings to college undergraduates. All that they need to know about introduction is given in the textbooks on N. T. Literature. Where there are advanced students who can properly be directed to further reading on the subject, the following should be available in the library:

J. Moffatt, *An Introduction to the Literature of the New Testament*, Scribner, 1911.

E. J. Goodspeed, *An Introduction to the New Testament*, Univ. of Chicago Press, 1937; rev. JBR, vol. v. pt. 4, Nov. 1937, p. 194.

G. B. Ayre, *Origins and Growth of the New Testament*, Blackie, London; rev. JBR, vol. vi, pt. 4, Nov. 1938, p. 230.

K. and S. Lake, *An Introduction to the New Testament*, Harper, 1937; rev. JBR, vol. v. pt. 3, Aug. 1937, p. 135.

A. S. Peake, *A Critical Introduction to the New Testament*, Scribner, 1910.

GOSPEL CRITICISM

This subject is very likely to be presented to students on the basis of their use of a

*The author of this article neglects to mention his own book, "Essentials of Bible History," Nelson, 1939, which is published in two parts, "Part I. The Old Testament," and "Part II. The New Testament." The second volume ought to be included in any list dealing with the best books in the field of New Testament history. Ed.

³⁰Rev. ed. 1933, Macmillan; rev. JNABI, vol. i, pt. 1, (1933), p. 33.

³¹Abingdon, 1938; rev. JBR, vol. vi, pt. 4, Nov. 1938, p. 236.

³²Scribner, 1936; rev. JNABI, vol. iv, pt. 2, (1936), p. 110.

³³Univ. of Chicago Press, 1916.

³⁴Columbia Univ. Press, 1932; rev. JNABI, vol. ii, pt. 2 (1934), p. 96.

³⁵Macmillan, 1925.

³⁶Macmillan, 1923.

³⁷Nelson, 1937; rev. JBR, vol. v. pt. 3, Aug. 1937, p. 136.

³⁸Harper, 1938; rev. JBR, vol. vi. pt. 3, Aug. 1938, p. 154.

synopticon. Bundy's *Syllabus and Synopsis*, previously mentioned, will serve splendidly where teachers wish to emphasize this feature. Some or several of the following should be on reserve:

E. D. Burton and H. R. Willoughby, *A Short Introduction to the Gospels*, Univ. of Chicago Press, 1926.

M. Dibelius, *From Tradition to Gospel*, Scribner, 1935.

C. H. Dodd, *History and the Gospel*, Scribner, 1938; rev. JBR, vol. vii, pt. 2, May, 1939, p. 94.

F. V. Filson, *Origins of the Gospels*, Abingdon, 1938; rev. JBR, vol. vii, pt. 1, Feb. 1939, p. 41.

F. C. Grant, *The Growth of the Gospels*, Abingdon, 1933; rev. JNABI, vol. i, pt. 1 (1933), p. 34; *Form Criticism*, Willett, Clark, 1934; rev. JNABI, vol. iii, pt. 1 (1935), p. 55.

R. H. Lightfoot, *History and Interpretation in the Gospels*, Harper, 1935; rev. JNABI, vol. iv, pt. 1 (1936), p. 51.

E. B. Redlich, *Student's Introduction to the Synoptic Gospels*, Longmans, 1936; *Form Criticism*, Scribner, 1939; rev. JBR, vol. vii, pt. 2, May, 1939, p. 93.

J. H. Ropes, *The Synoptic Gospels*, Harvard Univ. Press, 1934; rev. JNABI, vol. ii, pt. 2 (1934), p. 97.

B. H. Streeter, *The Four Gospels*, Macmillan, 1925.

V. Taylor, *The Formation of the Gospel Tradition*, Macmillan, 1933; rev. JNABI, vol. i, pt. 1 (1933), p. 34.

THE FOURTH GOSPEL

Some instructors devote a limited part of some one of their N. T. courses to the Gospel of John. R. H. Walker's *A Study of John's Gospel by the Questionnaire Method*³⁹ represents perhaps the simplest method of approach. B. W. Robinson's *The Gospel of John*⁴⁰ is serviceable as a textbook. As supplementary reading students should by all means be directed to Mary E. Lyman's

The Fourth Gospel and the Life of Today.⁴¹ For more extended investigative reading, the following should be available:

B. W. Bacon, *The Gospel of the Hellenists*, ed. by C. H. Kraeling, Holt, 1933.

E. C. Colwell, *John Defends the Gospel*, Willett, Clark, 1936; rev. JBR, vol. v, pt. 2, May, 1937, p. 83.

E. F. Scott, *The Fourth Gospel, Its Purpose and Theology*, Scribner, 1926.

CANON

For such work as one may wish to do with the subject of the N. T. canon, E. J. Goodspeed's *The Formation of the New Testament*⁴² will meet the requirements of undergraduates.

THE LIFE OF JESUS

Where the study of Jesus is but part of a more comprehensive Bible course, and therefore the time available is restricted, Jas. Moffatt's *Everyman's Life of Jesus*.⁴³ which is a narrative made up of passages selected from all four gospels, is a very useful little book. I have at times used it and at other times A. Sledd's *St. Mark's Life of Jesus*⁴⁴ to good advantage. T. H. Robinson's *St. Mark's Life of Jesus*⁴⁵ serves the same purpose. Where a full semester or more is assigned to a course in the Life of Jesus, any one of the following is a good textbook:

E. D. Burton and S. Mathews, *The Life of Christ*; rev. ed., Univ. of Chicago Press, 1927. In every respect an excellent book.

C. F. Kent, *The Life and Teachings of Jesus*, Scribner, 1913. An excellent book, still very useful; presents at the beginning of each section basic gospel material, followed by explanatory discussion.

E. I. Bosworth, *The Life and Teaching of Jesus*, Macmillan, 1924. I have found that students like this book.

G. A. Barton, *Jesus of Nazareth*, Macmillan, 1922.

W. B. Denny, *The Career and Significance of Jesus*, Nelson, 1933; rev. JNABI, vol. i, pt. 1 (1933), p. 32.

³⁹Abingdon, 1919.

⁴⁰Macmillan, 1925.

⁴¹Macmillan, 1931.

⁴²Univ. of Chicago Press, 1926.

⁴³Doran, 1925.

⁴⁴Cokesbury, 1927.

⁴⁵Doran, 1922.

C. E. Purinton, *The Reinterpretation of Jesus in the New Testament*, Scribner, 1932.

I. R. Beiler, *Studies in the Life of Jesus*, Cokesbury, 1936; rev. JBR, vol. v. pt. 1, Feb. 1937, p. 42.

No matter how long or how short the time available for the study of Jesus, every student should be required to read Mary E. Lyman's *Jesus*.⁴⁶ Perhaps one should never be extravagant in praising any book, but it is hard to avoid extravagance in commending this little book.

A shelf of reserve books on the Life of Jesus should be provided in every library, to which students may be directed for wider reading for investigative reports or essays. Such a shelf should include books of every type, conservative and liberal. One of the most valuable procedures is to require students to read a couple of books representative of the conservative point of view and a couple representing the liberal point of view. The following might well be among the books on such a shelf:

B. W. Bacon, *The Story of Jesus*, Century, 1927; *The Beginnings of Gospel Story*, Yale Univ. Press, 1909; *Jesus the Son of God*, Holt, 1930.

John Baillie, *The Place of Jesus Christ in Modern Christianity*, Scribner, 1929.

O. Borchert, *The Original Jesus*, Macmillan, 1933.

W. Bousset, *Jesus*, Putnam, 1911.

W. R. Bowie, *The Master*, Scribner, 1928.

S. J. Case, *Jesus, a New Biography*, Univ. of Chicago Press, 1927; *Jesus Through the Centuries*, Univ. of Chicago Press, 1932; *The Historicity of Jesus*, Univ. of Chicago Press, rev. ed., 1928.

H. S. Coffin, *The Portraits of Jesus Christ in the New Testament*, Macmillan, 1932.

A. E. Day, *Jesus and Human Personality*, Abingdon, 1934.

B. S. Easton, *Christ in the Gospels*, Scribner, 1930.

H. G. Enelow, *A Jewish View of Jesus*, Macmillan, 1920.

Wm. Fairweather, *Jesus and the Greeks*, T. and T. Clark, Edinburgh, 1924.

E. Fleg, *Jesus*, Dutton, 1935; rev. JNABI, vol. iii, pt. 1 (1935), p. 56.

H. E. Fosdick, *The Manhood of the Master*, Association Press, 1913.

G. H. Gilbert, *Jesus*, Macmillan, 1925.

T. R. Glover, *The Jesus of History*, R. R. Smith, 1930; *Jesus in the Experience of Men*, Doran, 1921.

M. Goguel, *The Life of Jesus*, Macmillan, 1933; rev. JNABI, vol. i, pt. 2 (1933), p. 32.

Ch. Guignebert, *Jesus*, Knopf, 1935.

A. C. Headlam, *The Life and Teaching of Jesus the Christ*, Oxford, Univ. Press, 1923.

W. B. Hill, *The Life of Christ*, Revell, 1917.

J. Klausner, *Jesus of Nazareth*, Macmillan, 1925.

P. Lobstein, *The Virgin Birth of Christ*, Putnam, 1903.

J. G. Machen, *The Virgin Birth of Christ*, Harper, 1930.

J. Mackinnon, *The Historic Jesus*, Longmans, Green, 1931.

H. D. A. Major, T. W. Manson, C. J. Wright, *The Mission and Message of Jesus*, Dutton, 1937; rev. JBR, vol. vi. pt. 2, May, 1938, p. 89; also rev. JBR, vol. vi. pt. 3, Aug. 1938, p. 157.

B. Mathews, *A Life of Jesus*, R. R. Smith, 1931.

P. More, *The Christ of the New Testament*, Princeton Univ. Press, 1924.

M. Radin, *The Trial of Jesus of Nazareth*, Univ. of Chicago Press, 1931.

C. and E. Raven, *The Life and Teaching of Jesus Christ*, Cambridge Univ. Press, 1933; rev. JNABI, vol. ii, pt. 2 (1934), p. 98.

A. E. J. Rawlinson, *The New Testament Doctrine of the Christ*, Longmans, 1929.

R. Roberts, *That Strange Man Upon His Cross*, Abingdon, 1934.

G. R. H. Shafto, *The Wonders of the Kingdom*, Doran, 1924.

J. A. Scott, *We Would Know Jesus*, Abingdon, 1936; rev. JBR, vol. v. pt. 4, Nov. 1937.

V. G. Simkovitch, *Toward the Understanding of Jesus*, Macmillan, 1921.

David Smith, *The Days of His Flesh*, Doran.

R. E. Speer, *The Finality of Jesus Christ*, Revell, 1933; *The Meaning of Christ to Me*, Revell, 1936.

J. Warschauer, *The Historical Life of Christ*, Macmillan, 1927.

⁴⁶Hazen Foundation, 1937; rev. JBR, vol. v, pt. 4, Nov. 1937, p. 183.

THE TEACHINGS OF JESUS

One cannot study the life of Jesus without paying attention to his teachings, and the books mentioned in this division also belong on the reserve list presented in the foregoing. Nevertheless, there are courses which concentrate on Jesus' teachings. For a textbook in such a course it would be hard to find a better than B. H. Branscomb's *The Teachings of Jesus*.⁴⁷ B. S. Easton's *What Jesus Taught*⁴⁸ presents the actual gospel passages topically arranged, as does H. B. Sharman's *Jesus as Teacher*.⁴⁹ The following ought to be available on library reserve:

B. W. Bacon, *The Sermon On the Mount*, Macmillan, 1902.

S. Brown-Serman and H. A. Prichard, *What Did Jesus Think?* Macmillan, 1935; rev. JNABI, vol. iii, pt. 1 (1935), p. 57.

R. Bultmann, *Jesus and the Word*, Scribner, 1934.

W. E. Bundy, *Our Recovery of Jesus*, Bobbs-Merrill, 1929; *The Religion of Jesus*, Bobbs-Merrill, 1928.

B. W. Burch, *The Ethical Teachings of the Gospels*, Abingdon, 1925.

E. D. Burton, *The Teachings of Jesus—A Source Book*, Univ. of Chicago Press, 1924.

G. A. Buttrick, *The Parables of Jesus*, R. R. Smith, 1931.

A. T. Cadoux, *The Parables of Jesus*, Macmillan, 1931.

M. Dibelius, *The Message of Jesus Christ*, Scribner, 1939; rev. JBR, vol. vii, pt. 3, Aug. 1939, p. 145.

C. H. Dodd, *The Parables of the Kingdom*, Scribner, 1936.

G. W. Fiske, *A Study of Jesus' Own Religion*, Macmillan, 1932.

C. F. Kent, *The Social Teachings of the Prophets and Jesus*, Scribner, 1917.

⁴⁷Cokesbury, 1931; rev. JNABI, vol. i, pt. 2 (1933), p. 31.

⁴⁸Abingdon, 1938; rev. JBR, vol. vii, pt. 2, May 1939, p. 102.

⁴⁹Harper, 1935; rev. JNABI, Vol. iv, pt. 1 (1936), p. 54.

⁵⁰Scribner, 1916.

⁵¹R. E. Hume, *The World's Living Religions*, Scribner, 1924.

⁵²Cokesbury, 1936.

C. F. Kent and J. W. Jenks, *Jesus' Principles of Living*, Scribner, 1927.

E. M. Ligon, *The Psychology of Christian Personality*, Macmillan, 1935; rev. JNABI, vol. iv, pt. 1 (1936), p. 63.

T. W. Manson, *The Teachings of Jesus*, Cambridge Univ. Press, 1931.

S. Mathews, *Jesus on Social Institutions*, Macmillan, 1928.

C. C. McCown, *The Genesis of the Social Gospel*, Knopf, 1929.

C. G. Montefiore, *The Religious Teaching of Jesus*, Macmillan, 1910.

A. W. Robinson, *Studies in the Teachings of the Sermon on the Mount*, Student Christian Movt., London, 1922.

B. W. Robinson, *The Sayings of Jesus*, Harper, 1930.

W. H. Robinson, *The Parables of Jesus*, Univ. of Chicago Press, 1928.

E. F. Scott, *The Kingdom and the Messiah*, Scribner, 1911; *The Kingdom of God in the New Testament*, Macmillan, 1931; *The Ethical Teaching of Jesus*, Macmillan, 1924.

C. A. A. Scott, *New Testament Ethics*, Macmillan, 1930.

A. W. Slaten, *What Jesus Taught*, Univ. of Chicago Press, 1922.

J. Stalker, *The Ethic of Jesus*, Doran.

G. B. Stevens, *The Teaching of Jesus*, Macmillan, 1901.

E. F. Tittle, *Jesus After Nineteen Centuries*, Abingdon, 1932.

R. H. Walker, *Jesus and Our Pressing Problems*, Abingdon, 1930.

A. N. Wilder, *Eschatology and Ethics in the Teaching of Jesus*, Harper, 1939; rev. JBR, vol. vii, pt. 3, Aug. 1939, pp. 141-143.

THE APOSTOLIC AGE

A course by this title is one of the most conventional offerings in academic Bible instruction. Preëminently the best textbook is C. F. Kent's *The Work and Teachings of the Apostles*.⁵⁰ I have used this year after year and my students will not let me get away from it; of only one other textbook that I have ever used has the same been true.⁵¹ I regard Wm. Scott's *A History of the Early Christian Church*,⁵² and M. F. Enslin's *Christian Beginnings*⁵³ as first rate textbooks.

As in the case of the Life and Teachings of Jesus, so here there should be an ample reserve shelf of books available to students for investigative reading. The following are suggested:

M. E. Andrews, *The Ethical Teaching of Paul*, Univ. of N. Carolina Press, 1934; rev. JNABI, vol. ii. pt. 2 (1934), p. 94.

S. Angus, *The Environment of Early Christianity*, Scribner, 1917; *The Mystery Religions and Christianity*, J. Murray, London, 1925; *The Religious Quests of the Graeco-Roman World*, Scribner, 1929.

B. W. Bacon, *Jesus and Paul*, Macmillan, 1921; *The Apostolic Message*, Century, 1925; *The Story of St. Paul*, Houghton, Mifflin, 1904.

G. A. Barton, *The Apostolic Age and the New Testament*, Univ. of Penn. Press, 1936; rev. JNABI, vol. iv, pt. 2 (1936), p. 112.

H. J. Cadbury, *The Making of Luke-Acts*, Macmillan, 1927.

S. J. Case, *Experience With the Supernatural in Early Christian Times*, Century, 1929; *Makers of Christianity*, Holt, 1934; *The Evolution of Early Christianity*, Univ. of Chicago Press, 1914; *The Social Origins of Christianity*, Univ. of Chicago Press, 1923; *The Social Triumph of the Ancient Church*, Harper, 1933.

F. M. Derwacter, *Preparing the Way For Paul*, Macmillan, 1930.

A. Deissmann, *Light From the Ancient East*, Doran, 1927; *Paul, a Study in Social and Religious History*, Doran, 1926; *The Religion of Jesus and the Faith of Paul*, Doran, 1926.

C. H. Dodd, *The Apostolic Preaching and its Developments*, Willett, Clark, 1937.

G. S. Duncan, *St. Paul's Ephesian Ministry*, Scribner, 1930.

I. Edman, *The Mind of Paul*, Holt., 1935; rev. JNABI, vol. iv, pt. 2, (1936), p. 113.

M. S. Enslin, *The Ethics of Paul*, Harper, 1930.

Wm. Fairweather, *The Background of the Epistles*, Scribner, 1935.

F. J. Foakes-Jackson, *The Life of St. Paul*, Boni and Liveright, 1926; *Peter, Prince of Apostles*, Doran, 1927, *The Rise of Gentile Christianity*, Doran, 1927.

P. Gardner, *The Religious Experience of St. Paul*, Putnam, 1913.

T. R. Glover, *The Influence of Christ in the Ancient World*, Yale Univ. Press, 1929; *Paul of Tarsus*, Doran, 1925.

A. Harnack, *The Mission and Expansion of Christianity*, Vol I, Putnam, 1909.

W. B. Hill, *The Apostolic Age*, Revell, 1922.

G. C. Hunter, *Luke, First Century Physician*, Harper, 1937; rev. JBR, vol. vi. pt. 4, Nov. 1938, p. 232.

M. R. James, *The Apocryphal New Testament*, Oxford Univ. Press, 1924.

K. Lake, *Landmarks in the History of Early Christianity*, Macmillan, 1922; *Paul, His Heritage and Legacy*, Oxford Univ. Press, 1934, rev. JNABI, vol. ii, pt. 2 (1934), p. 94.

A. McGiffert, *The Apostolic Age*, Scribner, 1920.

J. G. Machen, *The Origin of Paul's Religion*, Macmillan, 1921.

B. Mathews, *Paul the Dauntless*, Revell, 1916.

Wm. Morgan, *The Religion and Theology of Paul*, Scribner, 1917.

A. D. Nock, *St. Paul*, Harper, 1938; rev. JBR, vol. vii, pt. 2, May 1939, p. 95.

F. O. Norton, *The Rise of Christianity*, Univ. of Chicago Press, 1924.

E. W. Parsons, *The Religion of the New Testament*, Harper, 1939, rev. JBR, vol. vii, pt. 3, Aug. 1939, p. 143.

F. G. Peabody, *The Apostle Paul and the Modern World*, Macmillan, 1923.

O. Pfeleiderer, *Primitive Christianity*, 4 vols., Putnam, 1906.

F. C. Porter, *The Mind of Christ in Paul*, Scribner, 1930.

W. M. Ramsay, *Pauline and Other Studies*, Hodder and Stoughton; *St. Paul the Traveler and Roman Citizen*, Putnam, 1896; *The Cities of St. Paul*, Doran; *The Teaching of Paul in Terms of the Present Day*, Hodder and Stoughton, 1913; *The Church in the Roman Empire*, Putnam, 1893; *Luke the Physician*, Hodder and Stoughton.

D. W. Riddle, *Early Christian Life*, Willett, Clark, 1936.

B. W. Robinson, *The Life of Paul*, Univ. of Chicago Press, 1918.

J. H. Ropes, *The Apostolic Age*, Scribner, 1912.

A. Sabatier, *The Apostle Paul*, Hodder and Stoughton.

C. A. A. Scott, *St. Paul, the Man and the Teacher*, Macmillan, 1936; rev. JBR, vol. v, pt. 2, May, 1937.

E. F. Scott, *The Beginnings of the Church*, Scribner, 1914; *The First Age of Christianity*, Macmillan, 1926; *The Gospel and its Tributaries*, Scribner, 1929; *The Validity of the Gospel Record*, Scribner, 1938, rev. JBR, vol. vi, pt. 2, May 1938, p. 90.

H. C. Sheldon, *New Testament Theology*, Macmillan, 1911.

David Smith, *The Life and Letters of St. Paul*, Doran.

F. A. Spencer, *Beyond Damascus*, Harper, 1934; rev. JNABI, vol. ii, pt. 2 (1934), p. 94.

B. H. Streeter, *The Primitive Church*, Macmillan, 1929.

R. H. Walker, *Paul's Secret of Power*, Abingdon, 1935.

H. R. Willoughby, *Pagan Regeneration*, Univ. of Chicago Press, 1929.

C. von Weizsäcker, *The Apostolic Age*, 2 vols., Putnam, 1907.

The Reformer Meets A Taoist

(Continued from page 184)

man with "duty to one's neighbor," and doubt entered the world. Is this what you would give them?

Reformer: I would be different. I would teach them love. God would be their strength, their guide. I would make their moral life the prelude to eternal felicity.

Taoist: Eternal felicity or eternal woe. I would give them nothing. Only by discarding the artificial civilization which you would teach them can they regain natural harmony.

Reformer: They would not be happy.

Taoist: Is not the horse happier in its native condition? Does not the potter destroy the character of the clay? Does not the carpenter destroy the tree by his interfering skill? Man has Heaven-sent instincts. Would you have me interfere with them and cause human misery? Only the Tao can save them. It is humble, seeking the lowest place like water. Yet like water, the softest

thing in the world, it dissolves the hardest thing. The Tao is the source and support of all things. It works without effort. It does nothing yet it accomplishes everything. It works for good, and man by yielding himself to it, unresisting, unstriving, may reach his highest well-being. There will be no suffering, for suffering can only come with the departure of innocence and simplicity. Man will float on the placid river of time and eventually be absorbed in the ocean of Tao.

The Reformer: But there will be chaos if I do not teach them. I cannot stay here and do nothing. Here it is deserted and desolate. Down there the new people are coming forth. I must go and lead them. (Disappears into the valley.)

Taoist: Teach them? Study is worse than waste of time for it multiplies harmful notions. Deserted here? Desolate here? The Tao is here. Tao is everywhere. I will sit here and meditate on the Tao.

EDITORIAL

Integrating Religion and Higher Education

It is our hope that an entire issue of the Journal during the year 1940 may be devoted to a discussion of experiments in the integration of religion and higher education now under way in American institutions of higher education. While we have in mind to ask specific individuals to assist us in the preparation of this feature issue, we should nevertheless be pleased to have others who are interested in the general problem to submit suggestions.

A very essential preliminary step in thinking about the integration of religion and education is to define terms. Exactly what do we mean by integration? In what sense are we using that word of many connotations, religion? It is important that these words be clearly defined in order that misunderstandings and unnecessary antagonisms may be avoided.

In an editorial published in Volume VI, Part 4 of the JBR we said:

"Integration to many people seems to mean a mechanical tinkering with the curriculum, substituting a small number of subject-matter groupings for a larger number of departments in the college catalog, offering an 'orientation course,' or some such measure. This appears to us to be a fundamental misconception of the meaning of integration. Integration is not something done to the curriculum. It is a process of development within the personality of the student for whom the curriculum and the college exist."

This statement still appears valid in our eyes, but in the light of certain experiences in an institution where the attempt is being made to encourage integration, certain clarifications occur to us. Not only is integration not something done to the curriculum. It is not something done to the teacher, either. Nor to the student. It is, however, something which the *student does to himself*

or herself with whatever aid may be received from intelligent teachers and intelligently planned curricula. For ourselves we should say that the purpose of any program of integration was to *help each student to find himself or herself* on the highest level of which he or she is capable.

Teachers and students who do not react unfavorably to the word, integration, may be bewildered if not antagonized by the phrase "integration of religion and education." That this is the case should not be surprising in view of the secular character of our American educational institutions. Dean Van Dusen of Union Theological Seminary is quite justified in speaking as he does elsewhere in this issue of a "higher education increasingly indifferent to organized religion."

Yet there is a feeling abroad among students, teachers, and administrators in these same institutions of higher learning that something is wrong with our secularized education. Moreover there is general agreement that what is wrong is the absence of any unifying principle in our educational life to give a sense of direction. That this is sensed by students as well as by college administrators and teachers is suggested by the following statement we believe to be typical of the undergraduate mind:

"College gave me no ample reason for my doing; it did not fit my actions into any larger pattern. . . . Until I can get outside of and beyond myself I have no permanent reason why I should overcome laziness in my character; no social imperative whereby a clean community, rid of open sewers and graft and social disease, comes before my small, petty pursuits. To get such motives one has to go below the surface, and the tragedy is that college never took us very deep. . . . College gave us no philosophy of living. We went there and found spokes but no hub to hold them together. We came away

with knowledge but no purpose, and therein is our dilemma."¹

The need described in this undergraduate statement is essentially religious. Yet it is impossible to make use of the word, religion, unless it be used in the very broadest sense. Religion is not identical with the church. It is not necessarily identical with Christianity. If a Jewish student is enabled to "come to himself," it is not likely to be by way of Christianity. Then, too, the campus agnostic may achieve an essentially religious integration without being willing

to use the word, religion. In such a case, no genuinely religious person would quibble over terminology.

Surely if an educational institution by means of its teachers, its curriculum, or in any other way is able to help students to find a "reason for living" which is both reasonable and ethically creative, it will be doing something eminently worth while.

It is in order to find out what colleges and universities are doing to meet this need that we contemplate devoting time and space to a special feature issue of the Journal dealing with this problem. Toward this aim we solicit your aid.

C. E. P.

¹Quoted by C. E. Conover, in article entitled "Students and Religion: A Reply," *The Christian Century*, July 19, 1939, p. 901.

PROGRAM OF THE ANNUAL MEETING

DECEMBER 26 AND 27, 1939

UNION THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY, NEW YORK CITY

Tuesday Evening, December 26

8:00 P. M. Business

President's Address—"Christianity and the Democratic Ideal"

Wednesday, December 27

9:45 A. M. **Symposium: The Renaissance of Theology and the Undergraduate**

"Factors Responsible for the Renewed Interest in the Religious Ideas of the Bible"

"The Significance of This Development in the Teaching of the Bible to Undergraduates"

"History and Theology: A Study of Their Relationships"

Business Meeting

2:30-5:00 P. M. "The Textual Basis of Current English Translations of the New Testament and Some Remarks on the Present Status of Textual Studies"

"Jeremiah's Doctrine and New Covenant, with Particular Reference to the Development of the Concept of Monotheism in Judaism"

"The Origin of Early Christian Forms of Symbolic Art"

8:00 P. M. Joint Meeting with the American School of Oriental Research

BOOK REVIEWS

Spirit and Its Freedom. By GEORGE F. THOMAS. Chapel Hill: The University of North Carolina Press, 1939. xiii + 149 pages, \$1.00.

Dr. George F. Thomas, professor of philosophy in the University of North Carolina, has published in book form his John Calvin McNair lectures. The first chapter discusses conceptions of spirit,—with a comparison of Greek and Christian ideals which should be required reading for every student and teacher of religion; it far surpasses the standard treatment in Paulsen's *Ethics*. In the second chapter, on the essence of spirit, the best insights of Scheler, Hegel, and Hartmann are presented and acutely criticized. Chapter three treats of freedom and the spirit; if it does not exhaust the subject of freedom, it treats it with a sureness of touch and a profundity of insight rare in more mature philosophers. In the last chapter on politics and the spirit, Professor Thomas presents the essence of his social philosophy, which in face of present social realities, maintains full confidence in spiritual ideals.

The excellence of this little book is such that it might well be put into a small library of twentieth century American classics of philosophy. Probably no two would agree about such a library. For himself, the reviewer would like to nominate William James's *Pragmatism*, Josiah Royce's *Philosophy of Loyalty*, Borden Parker Bowne's *Personalism*, John Dewey's *Reconstruction in Philosophy*, and either James Bissett Pratt's *Matter and Spirit* or his *Naturalism*; and George F. Thomas's *Spirit and Its Freedom* is fully worthy of membership in this list. Anyone who had read them all has a good start in the understanding of contemporary American philosophy.

The Quest for Religious Certainty. By HAROLD A. BOSLEY. Chicago: Willett, Clark & Co., 1939. xi + 235 pages. \$2.50.

Dr. Harold A. Bosley has written a stimulating and instructive book which arouses the present reader to both hearty agreement and hearty disagreement.

As the title indicates, Dr. Bosley here applies to religion the principle of Dewey's *Quest for Certainty*. He holds that religious thinkers who demand absolute certainty for religious faith are on the wrong track. Religion, he holds, is compatible with the tentativeness of science and its experimental testing of hypotheses. He elaborates the meaning of this tentativeness, and its relation to probability and contingency. Then, borrowing from Morris Cohen the principle of polarity, he holds that a synthesis of tentativeness and certainty may be obtained in theology, worship, and conduct.

This very sketchy summary will indicate the grounds of the reviewer's hearty approval of the book. The correlation of religious faith with scientific and philosophic method, the recognition that all our religious concepts are hypotheses subject to criticism and correction, and the emphasis on the fact of contingency in the universe (what this reviewer has called givenness, but in a special sense) are all wholesome, frank, and reasonable emphases. The book is written in a clearer and more workmanlike style than much current religious literature; and the reader who wishes to seek further is helped by ample documentation.

Nevertheless, *The Quest for Religious Certainty* is far from being completely satisfactory. On several counts, it will elicit hearty disapproval from others than the reviewer. The chief defect of the book it shares with the thought of the author's teacher, Professor Henry Nelson Wieman.

That defect is a fundamental contradiction about the principles of certainty. On the one hand, metaphysical certainty is presupposed throughout. The entire book is a straightforward exposition of naturalistic instrumentalism without a trace of doubt or uncertainty, without any consideration of objections to naturalism as a metaphysic or of possible alternative views. It is true that instrumentalists are not the only metaphysicians who are dogmatic; but until dogmatism is banished from metaphysics as well as from religion little progress will be made.

The book plainly manifests metaphysical dogmatism, in spite of the religiously open-minded spirit of the author. No metaphysical alternative to naturalism is given any consideration. Theism in the sense of belief in a conscious personal God is not, it is true, denied; the love of God and the will of God are mentioned. But there is not the slightest consideration of personality or purpose as metaphysical principles. Theism is very lively today. In the neoscholasticism of Maritain, Gilson, and others; in the religious realism of Macintosh and a large group influenced by him, including Bennett and Calhoun; in the idealism of Hocking and the personalism of many influenced by Bowne, Royce, Ladd, Howison, Peirce, and Whitehead, the conception of God as a personal spirit is a living metaphysical option. Dr. Bosley appears to think either that this possibility is not worthy of attention or that it somehow excludes the principle of tentativeness, while naturalism does not do so. The issue is so important that Dr. Bosley should face it. In this book it has every appearance of being the skeleton in the closet. Is it tentative to be a naturalist, but not tentative to be a theist? Why?

The author's curious unsensitiveness to the theistic problem is clearly illustrated in his treatment of ideals. For a moment he considers (on p. 219) the possibility of an alternative to Dewey's instrumentalism; but

the only alternative he mentions is that of Nicolai Hartmann's metaphysics. As is well known, Dewey and Hartmann are quite at one in their attitude to the vital point of theism. Both are utterly opposed to the idea of a personal God. What Dr. Bosley thinks on this point he has not made explicit. The spiritual situation of the present is so desperately confused that all of the light that can be shed on it is needed. A mind like that of Dr. Bosley could be most helpful if it would face the problem. It is not facing the problem to rest in the definition of God as "that aspect of progressive integration in the universe which manifests itself on the human level in the growth of values" (pp. 138-139). Plato's words "the best soul regulates the whole cosmos" (*Laws*, 897C) are clearer.

Nothing said in this review should deter any person from reading this book. It is instructive and provocative to an unusual degree.

EDGAR SHEFFIELD BRIGHTMAN

Boston University

Social Religion. By DOUGLAS C. MACINTOSH. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1939. 336 pages. \$3.00.

Professor Macintosh has at last given us a systematic discussion of a subject which has long been close to his heart. He writes with a more informal style and with more abandon than is the case with his other books. The book has two parts which deal with quite different materials. The first part is a defence of the religious basis of the Social Gospel and in particular of the author's conviction that the Social Gospel is the direct result of the teaching of Jesus. The second part is a series of studies of concrete social problems—war, poverty, civil liberty, political strategy. In each case Professor Macintosh furnishes us with summaries of the relevant facts and diagnoses, and indicates the practical program, which he favors. The

reader may wonder why Professor Macintosh thought it necessary to include so much data from available contemporary sources but I suspect that he wanted to give a demonstration of a theologian who keeps close to facts. In each case he has done a useful job. The two parts of the book are a symbol of the author's conviction that society's greatest need is a combination of both the spirit and the principles of prophetic religion and the wisdom and techniques based upon the social sciences.

Professor Macintosh is a brave man. He takes on most of the New Testament scholars and most of the theologians of the whole trend from Niebuhr to Barth as adversaries. I am no New Testament scholar and I feel rather bewildered by all the various ways of making Jesus appear too modern or too ancient, but I welcome the way in which Professor Macintosh pushes through all obstacles to a conception of Christianity in which the teachings and personality of Jesus are central and to an interruption of the teachings of Jesus which makes them directly social in their implications. The author has much to say about the social and economic implications of the beatitudes. He interprets the teachings of Jesus as good news for the poor in the economic sense and "bad news for the rich." He sees Jesus as in this respect a successor of the prophets and reads the gospels through the prophets rather than, as is now the fashion, through the epistles. He interprets the Kingdom in social and ethical rather than in eschatological terms and puts much emphasis upon the parallelism in the words of the Lord's Prayer: "Thy Kingdom Come, thy will be done on earth." This is all refreshing though I think that the author does at times press the details of parables too much and that he gives insufficient weight to the eschatological interpretation of Jesus. But in regard to the latter matter we can expect frequent shifts of emphasis. My chief criticism is that it should be made clear that

even on the basis of other interpretations of Jesus than the one here presented the Social Gospel is valid. Obedience to the will of God as understood in terms of the command of love—which is central in Paul and John as well as in the teachings of Jesus—in *our situation* has inevitable social implications. This would be true even if in the situation in which Jesus lived and in the light of his world view and within the limits of possible social action open to him and his followers he did not identify himself with the struggles of the poor as a social class. Even if Prof. Macintosh's interpretation is overdrawn it remains true that Jesus had much to say about elemental human need and that his gospel was "bad news" for the rich and the respectable.

The author's argument with the theologians who allow a one-sided pessimism concerning what man can do or a one-sided doctrine of grace to becloud their sense of social responsibility seems to me to be more conclusive than his arguments with the critics. He rejects Reinhold Niebuhr's insistence that there is a gulf between the best possible course open to us and the will of God. Macintosh dismisses with equal impatience the individualistic Christians who "have been making the Cross of Christ a substitute for bearing their own cross or for sharing his cross with him" and those who contemplate a changed social order without the evangelization of individuals.

In the second part of the book Professor Macintosh takes us through a discussion of concrete issues and comes down on one side of most controversial questions. He leaves the war question more open than the others. Like many of the rest of us he is perplexed to the point of confusion. He is almost a pacifist. He opposes American isolation and favors embargoes against aggressors. He believes in world organization based upon the curtailment of national sovereignty. He sees that it is almost equally bad for us to arm or to fail to arm. He has kinder

words to say about English policy and Chamberlain than most commentators. It should be said that he doesn't attempt to set forth an immediate policy as much as a long range program. The discussion of economic problems has a clearer sense of direction. There is a careful survey of the New Deal, its legislation and its achievements. In general Professor Macintosh believes that we should support the New Deal, avoid third parties as impractical, press for a large measure of socialization. He advocates the socialization of natural resources, public utilities, basic industries, distribution, finance and banking. He agrees with those who believe that it is impossible under capitalism to solve the economic problem. The book ends with a favorable account of the American Labor Party which, while in advance of the major parties in its program, does not run candidates against the more liberal candidates of the two major parties. In certain quarters this book should cause no less alarm than a book entitled, "Capitalism and its Culture" to the author of which it is dedicated.

In regard to these discussions of concrete problems Professor Macintosh makes it clear that all sincere Christians need not agree. When we come to combine sure Christian imperatives and insights with judgments concerning concrete facts and programs there is room for differences of opinion. What I miss in the book is any discussion of ways in which the Church can fit itself to give guidance to the individual in the understanding of facts and in the choosing of programs. It might be entitled "Social Religion without a Church." The book leaves us with the picture of the individual Christian making his way among secular movements. Professor Macintosh seems untouched by the new-found appreciation of the possibilities of the Church as a factor in society.

This is a vigorous book which should help to rescue Christianity from its allies con-

trolled by capitalistic assumptions and from its interpreters who deny the importance or the possibility of Christian social action. It would make a text for those who want Biblical interpretation (sometimes perhaps as a foil!), theology, and social analyses in one volume.

JOHN C. BENNETT

Pacific School of Religion

The Prophets Tell Their Own Story. By ELMER A. LESLIE. New York: The Abingdon Press, 1939. 307 pages. \$2.00.

This new volume on the prophets from Amos to Jeremiah differs from the numerous books on the subject in an important respect. It is the first attempt, to the reviewer's best knowledge, to provide the great prophets with autobiographies. By presenting the prophets as living individuals of flesh and blood, standing on a platform and telling their hearers about their experiences and thoughts, Professor Leslie supplies a dramatic touch and a vividness often lacking in biblical investigation. In solving the problems raised by higher and textual criticism, in presenting new translations of the most significant prophetic oracles, and in taking into account modern research, for which he provides a well-selected bibliography, Dr. Leslie gives evidence of his scholarly competence, without allowing technical matters to mar the stories which the prophets tell about themselves. Thus the volume can be warmly recommended to undergraduates and general readers, although only those with some acquaintance of the present stage of biblical studies will be able to appreciate the scope of the researches required in writing the book and the author's original contributions.

Professor Leslie has taken special pains to present the prophets in their historical setting and has succeeded in avoiding the common tendency, against which Professor H. J. Cadbury has warned biblical scholars

in his book *The Peril of Modernizing Jesus*, of remaking biblical heroes in our own image. His sincere objectivity and his striving for historical reality are evident. Nevertheless, in presenting the prophets as telling their own story he has failed in creating the illusion that we are listening to them rather than to him, possibly because the task is beyond realization. Long before Leslie, a priest of Jerusalem in the second half of the 7th century B. C. composed a long address of Moses with an autobiographical introduction (the Deuteronomic Code). But, quite apart from "modernizing" Moses with regard to the religious point of view, he made Moses speak in a typically "Deuteronomic" style.

Professor Leslie avoids the peril of injecting into the prophets his own religious convictions, but inevitably their speech savors of the style of the Professor of Old Testament in Boston University addressing a class of theological students. Innumerable expressions used by the prophets in this book have no equivalent whatever in Biblical Hebrew and represent concepts which the prophets could never have understood. To illustrate: Amos speaks of "the climax of these psychological experiences" (p. 18); Hosea of "emphatic words that throbbed with the atmosphere of imminent crisis" (p. 64); Isaiah borrows from the late Professor J. H. Breasted the expression "the Fertile Crescent" (p. 78), and denounces "the dilettantes of fast Judean society" whose "self-indulgence . . . blunted their official conscience" (p. 88); Micah speaks of "moral anarchy and social chaos" (p. 151); Habakkuk's "ecstatic experiences" often shook him to the depth of his being (p. 204). Jeremiah was not deceived by the Book of the Law found in the Temple in the reign of Josiah: long before De Wette and the Graf-Wellhausen School he knew that "the new law code was none other than the kernel of that great book [i. e. Deuteronomy]. It represented a fresh codification . . . in the spirit of . . . Amos, Isaiah, and Micah

and especially . . . Hosea" (p. 234). Like some modern critics, Jeremiah called Micah "Judah's noble preacher of democracy" (p. 244).

To paraphrase Isaac's words, "The hands are the hands of the prophets, but the voice is Leslie's voice." And Leslie, in the reviewer's opinion, is often willing to accept the theories of Sellin, Mowinckel, Gunkel, Balla, and others, when they rest on evidence of dubious validity. He claims that Habakkuk was a "Temple prophet" or cult prophet (cf. Mowinckel), a Temple singer, and a composer of liturgies and psalms, who in his boyhood listened to teachers of the Law in the Temple (p. 204f). He discovers the New Year festival of the enthronization of Yahweh in Hos. 7:5 (p. 55); he claims that Gomer the wife of Hosea was a sacred harlot, a votary of Astarte (p. 40); he discovers the Adonis cult in Hosea (p. 67f) and Isaiah (p. 100); he occasionally regards Chronicles as a reliable source for pre-exilic history (pp. 38, 183, 273). Some of the passages utilized are of questionable authenticity: e. g. Am. 1:2; 5:27; Hos. 8:5f; 9:10b; 11:1-4 in part 8f; Is. 2:2-4 17; 5:30; 10:33f; 38-39; Mic. 1:7; 6; Zeph. 2:15; 3; Nah. 1:1-10; 2:1; also the puns in Am. 5:5b; 8:2 (cf. Ez. 7:6); Is. 5:7; Jer. 1:11f.

ROBERT H. PFEIFFER

Harvard University

God in History. By OTTO PIPER. New York: The Macmillan Company, 1939. xxi + 189 pages. \$2.00.

History has once again become a problem. Gone is the notion that history is merely the continuation of the evolutionary process consisting of a steady and inevitable progress towards Eutopia. We are confronted with the high probability that *our* era will end in ruin and give way to another which is most unlikely to usher in the golden age. The Christian man who had identified progress with divine purpose

operating in history is forced to reconsider the actual relationship between God and the historical process. Besides, he is confronted with atheistical interpretations of history which speak in terms of conflicts of powers and interests, or in terms of quasi-organic birth, growth, decay, and death of civilization and cultures. Such theories of history as well as the facts underlying them have made a deep impression upon recent Christian thought. They have convinced tough-minded men like Berdyaev, Barth, Tillich, and R. Niebuhr that history will always bear the burden of human sin and folly. Such thinkers present God's relationship to the world in terms of paradox, or dialectic, or mystic transcendence.

But not so Dr. Piper. In "holy history," "in which the Holy Spirit of God takes a direct part," he finds a manifest outcome of Divine activity (p. 66). He presents the history of the Jewish-Christian religion, together with all history influenced by it, as the unequivocal evidence of "God in history." In the fullness of time, after the Jewish religion, Greek culture, and Roman imperial rule, had prepared the world for Christianity, and yet proved themselves "barren" and fallen into "a state of absolute helplessness" with regard to religion and morals, the Son of God came into the world and brought in the "new aeon." "Thus Christ's appearance is not only directly responsible for the destruction of Jerusalem and the dispersion of the Jews, but also for the collapse of ancient civilization and of the Roman Empire" (p. 20). He bound Satan and became the Determiner "of the course of history" (p. 27).

Thus the new aeon began. "In the New Covenant the Son of God became Himself an agent of history. Heaven and earth were thus linked together in a permanent historical process and history was directly tied up with eternity" (p. 112). "The church which was founded by Jesus was not merely a transcendent body in Heaven, but an historical organization" (p. 113). Dr. Piper

calls the Church "the center of history" and the "handmaiden of the Lord." In not many paragraphs he describes the decisive rôle she played in the formation of medieval Europe, in the determination of the course of Western philosophy and moral life, and in giving Western civilization a unified character which has set it above all others (p. 132). In all this he sees "God in history," producing a church and a civilization which seem to allow no doubt with regard to their Divine origin.

There is hardly a fact in Christian history which does not exhibit God's activity according to a logic obvious to Dr. Piper. "When St. Francis and St. Dominic founded their orders they vowed poverty, and relied entirely on the Lord's promises that He would grant His follower's requests. Is it not an almost unbelievable fact that only a generation after their foundation these orders had become so wealthy that they had to fight against the temptations of abundance" (p. 141)? "Our Saviour so arranges history as to serve as an education for His followers" (p. 149). God disabled the Eastern Church, which was "alienated from its essence," "by the impact of the Arabs" (p. 150). "The Crusaders fulfilled the function of 'bringing the European nations together once more' (p. 152). "God enabled the layman to study the Bible through the use of paper instead of costly parchment . . ." (*ibidum*). Higher criticism destroyed bibliolatry, and recent archaeology "overthrew most of the critical theories concerning the age, the trustworthiness, the truthfulness and the superiority of the Holy Scripture" (p. 153). So be it.

Dr. Piper is aware of the dangerous situation of Western civilization at the present time and exhorts the Church to make its contribution to our need by "becoming aware of its potential treasures and making use of them for the good of the world." He recommends "habits of regular prayer, the quiet of a Sunday, and the meditation upon eternal truth . . ." (pp. 170, 171). "We

must not be disturbed by the vicissitudes of history." For they lead straight on to the glorious manifestation of Christ," "to the resurrection of the dead, and conscious life in heaven or hell" (pp. 178, 177).

There is also the matter of Dr. Piper's views on the history of the Jewish people who rejected Christ, "distorted the Law and the Prophets," "trusted in the fact that they were Abraham's seed and hoped for the 'luck of Jacob,'" all of which led to "shameless arrogance and moral and religious indifference." All Israel "tacitly approved of Jesus' pitiful end. Hence all Jews were responsible for His death. This is the reason they all have to endure the divine punishment." The purpose of God in history is now carried out by the church" (pp. 91, 92).

I should have liked this book very much. It is a carefully written and resolute attempt to find God in history. It is a real corrective to present day sophisticated views of history which conceal a firm disbelief in God's sovereignty over the world under thick clouds of paradox, dialectic, and compound words signifying nothing. And yet, its pretence of knowing the logic of God's ways in detail and its arrogantly Christian (!) point of view nauseated me. I hope it will not get into the hands of a Jew, or a heathen, or an atheist, or a Christian.

JOSEPH HAROUTUNIAN

Wellesley College

The Modern Movement in American Theology. By FRANK HUGH FOSTER. New York: Fleming H. Revell Co., 1939. 219 pages. \$1.75.

The Faith We Declare. By EDWIN LEWIS. Nashville: The Cokesbury Press, 1939. 236 pages. \$2.00.

The late Professor Foster of Oberlin College presents, in the first of these volumes, a sketch of the history of Protestant theology from the Civil War to the

World War. He organized his materials about the dominant interest of the succeeding periods, and confined his discussion chiefly to a few of the more important thinkers of each period. The first period discussed, that of the Civil War and the years immediately following, centers about the problem of eschatology as found in the writings of such New England Congregationalists as James M. Whiton, Washington Gladden, T. T. Munger, Egbert C. Smyth and his younger brother Newman Smyth. The next problem was provoked by the publication of Darwin's works on evolution. Foster calls attention to the attitudes of such men as Asa Gray, in the scientific field, and Charles Hodge in the theological field, particularly. Then follow several chapters devoted to the theology of Bushnell, Beecher, Gordon, William Newton Clarke, and Henry C. King, among others. The book ends with a chapter on "The Radical School," in which group Foster places himself.

Two ideas are driven home to one as he reads this volume. In the first place, the religious thinkers of this period of more than half a century proved themselves quite ignorant concerning the scientific theories they rose to condemn. Theologians and ministers damned that which they did not understand. As a result they found themselves confused and oftentimes defeated. Secondly, one is impressed by the naiveté with which many of these thinkers faced the problem of truth. As one writer, not too prominent, quoted by Foster, states it: "Much as I love truth in the abstract, I love my hope in immortality more. . . . If this, after all, is the best science can give me, then I pray, No more science. Let me live in my simple ignorance as my fathers lived before me; and when I shall at length be summoned to my final repose, let me still be able to fold the drapery of my couch about me and lie down to pleasant, even though they be deceitful dreams" (p. 44). The test

of truth suggested here is obvious: *What I wish to believe I propose to believe, no matter what the facts in the case may be!* Of course, very few of the men discussed were as bald in their statements as this; but the reluctance with which they were willing to accept socially accepted and verified facts suggests they, too, *held the Faith more dear than the facts.*

Professor Lewis of Drew, in the Fondren Lectures at Southern Methodist University, Dallas, Texas, published as *The Faith We Declare*, has accepted a position which takes him back into the past for his theological milieu. He begins with a quest for "the essential content of the Christian faith," and arrives at what he terms Neo-Orthodoxy, namely, the conservative conception of the Christian faith as centered in the Divine Christ. Lewis' position may be seen as one of the recent reactions to the uncritical acceptance of scientific method, particularly, as the one and only one way to religious truth. Twenty years ago, in 1919, D. C. Macintosh published his *Theology as an Empirical Science*. He attempted to use the concepts and the methodology of empirical science in the development of theology. I suppose that today even Macintosh himself would insist that this is impossible; that the two fields are quite different and thus the concepts and methods of research must of necessity likewise be different. This overemphasis upon science and scientific method evoked a reaction, and we are today in the midst of a definite "flight from science." Lewis belongs in the vanguard of this group. He adopted as his test of religious truth this: "What think ye of Christ?" (p. 171). If one thinks of Christ as wholly human, then he will accept those doctrines only which are consistent with this view; if one believes Jesus Christ to have been divine as well as human—as Lewis does—then he will accept those doctrines which belong to the category of the "New Supernaturalism." So Lewis drove through

these lectures toward the conception of a Christian Faith essentially static and final; delivered to men in the past, and remaining essentially the same through all the succeeding centuries.

These two volumes—*The Modern Movement in American Theology* and *The Faith We Declare*—may well be read together. One shows the slow emergence of reason and critical analysis among religious thinkers, and the other shows the degree to which they may be given up even by intelligent and well-read folk.

WILLIAM HENRY BERNHARDT

The Iliff School of Theology

John Wesley. By FRANCIS J. McCONNELL, New York: The Abingdon Press, 1939. 355 pages. \$3.00.

Scientists tell us that we live in a new world. They do not mean that they have added one atom to the sum total of the universe; what they mean is that modern scientific researches have furnished a new type of spectacles to look at the world; and that new approach has given a new aspect to the world. It is somewhat in this sense that Bishop McConnell has written a new life of John Wesley. It is based upon the old material; but the approach is new and the result a surprisingly fresh view of the founder of the Methodist Church.

No one who knows the author and his abundant contributions to religious thought will fail to acknowledge his competence, native and acquired, to furnish an up-to-date treatment of his subject. It is more than a biography of a genius in religious leadership; it is a valuation of his achievement, with all absence of hero-worship, yet highly appreciative and sympathetic, as we might expect from his position of bishop; nevertheless, critical in the sense of discriminating. It consequently makes the volume a compendium to which one can profitably turn to gain an insight into the application

of permanent principles, as distinguished from temporary manifestations, which Methodism as a distinct religious movement has contributed to the solution of present day problems.

In the light of present day psychology of religion, to what extent is the bringing up, childhood, youth and experience of John Wesley to be the model for the training and education of the children and youth of our day? The data upon which to form an opinion is fully given and discussed in an enlightening and exceedingly interesting manner by the author in the chapter, "The Brand Plucked from the Fire," and goes far beyond the confines of Methodism.

The author regards the Aldersgate experience as epoch-making in Wesley's life and Methodism. But it happened in accordance with the laws of psychology; with the understanding "that natural laws are divine methods." The essence of the Aldersgate experience was that it changed religion from slavery into childhood. It was both gradual, as the Moravian influence proves, and sudden.

Wesley's object was not to found a church but a society; this explains both his autocracy and Methodist democracy. His influence on modern social and economic problems was practical rather than theoretical and indirect rather than direct. Modern capitalism had not yet arrived; and Wesley was a conservative and had no liking for revolution. He took an intense interest in the welfare of the masses, physical as well as spiritual. He believed, like the Master, in the value of the individual and the perfectibility of humanity. He trained his followers in leadership and defended freedom of speech. Like the prophets of old, he decried the extravagance of the rich at the expense of the poor.

The author delineates Wesley as a Puritan, conscientious, severe, opposed to frivolity, methodical to the extent of measuring every moment of his day, with a leaning to

asceticism. His was a great moral passion: to save men from sin. His two outstanding doctrines: "assurance" of divine favor and "scriptural holiness," he evaluated and proclaimed on account of their practical value: they made his converts happy and good. The dissolute and vicious became sober, respectable, thrifty, and in time even wealthy members of the community. These effects overbalanced the emotional and doctrinal extravagances which Wesley himself did not share. It is to the credit of Bishop McConnell that he has made clear beyond doubt that Wesley was not extravagantly emotional. His Aldersgate experience was vital indeed, but not as cataclysmic as formerly made out; and he became even less emotional with the subsiding of his physical vitality. And here the author has brought new light (a letter in cipher to his brother Charles, p. 210f) to bear on the fact that in his later years Wesley had no less faith in God and his mission but less "assurance;" something that will bring comfort to those who find themselves perplexed by varying moods in their emotional religious experience.

McConnell's *John Wesley* is destined to become the classic standard.

ISMAR J. PERITZ

Heroes of Thought. By JOHN MIDDLETON MURRY. New York: Julian Messner, Inc., 1938. 368 pages. \$3.50.

Many good things may be said of this book. It is brilliantly written. It contains excellent literary criticism, dealing in considerable part, as it does, with such literary personalities as Chaucer, Montaigne, Shakespeare, Milton, Goethe, Wordsworth, Shelley, and William Morris.

But it is more than a collection of essays in literary criticism. The author's real concern is with a moral analysis of modern civilization. "It is an attempt to show the emergence of the modern world from the

medieval one, as the process was lived by some of the prophetic men who were involved in it" (p. 16). It is also an attempt to discover what this civilization must do to be saved. In this sense the purpose of the author is a distinctly religious one.

The characters employed in successive chapters are men in whom was the "secret of change," as the author puts it in speaking of Cromwell. In addition to those mentioned above, they include Oliver Cromwell, Rousseau, William Godwin, and Karl Marx. The direction of change is the struggle for human equality in all its aspects, religious, political, economic. Murry judges each by his positive or negative contribution to this struggle. Wordsworth, for example, fares badly. He began as a poet with revolutionary vision. "He became a timid reactionary, and the life went out of his poetry. . . . Up to a point—which we put in 1805-07—we feel that we are being taken by him toward some splendid goal. After that point, we feel we are being led nowhere at all" (p. 285). Milton is unfavorably compared with Cromwell in this struggle for human freedom. Milton claims freedom for the individual to think as he will. Cromwell claims freedom for the individual to believe as he must. They come to the one center from opposite points of the circle, reach the same conclusion from different motions—Cromwell's of the heart, Milton's of the mind. Cromwell is Christian; Milton is not. The most significant figures in the process of social revolution, in the eyes of Murry, have been Cromwell, Rousseau, and Karl Marx and his chapters dealing with these personalities are the most interesting of the book. Oliver Cromwell played a truly creative role. Indeed, the Cromwellian revolution charts the entire course of democratic evolution. While Cromwell's men fought primarily for religious equality, "that religious equality had for its ultimate corollary political equality (which has since been won), and beyond that, economic equal-

ity (which has not been won)" (p. 132). It was the French revolution that eventually established political equality as an ideal, and the Russian which asserted equal economic rights for all men. In comparing these three revolutions, Murry offers a pattern of revolution which constitutes one of the most interesting sections of the book.

"The English anti-absolutist revolution, which left all property rights intact, was 'inspired' by the English Bible, culminated in the dictatorship of Cromwell and left for its ideal legacy—the annihilation of the divine right of Kings; the French anti-feudal revolution, which being bourgeois and petty-bourgeois (more truly, peasant), violently overthrow feudal property rights, drastically redistributed property, but left the property right intact, was inspired by Rousseau, and culminated in the dictatorship of Napoleon, and left for its ideal legacy—a second nullification of the divine right of Kings, and (more important) the assertion of equal political rights for all men as men; the Russian anti-absolutist revolution, which being bourgeois, and peasant, and proletarian, violently overthrow feudal property rights, for a moment redistributed feudal property among the peasants, but went on to abolish the property right altogether, was inspired by Marx, culminated in the dictatorship of Stalin, and left for its ideal legacy—a third nullification of the divine right of Kings, but, more important, the assertion of equal economic rights for all men as men. . . . In order to make that suggestive pattern truly progressive, something vital is lacking in the third revolution—the Russian. To make the creative pattern perfect: its ideal legacy needed to contain a reassertion of equal political rights for all men, just as the French Revolution reasserted the abolition of the divine right of Kings. For every great, creative revolution which begins from feudal society needs to assert all that was positively asserted by previous revolutions that began from the same point. The French Revolution thus truly completed the English Revolution; the Russian did not truly complete the French Revolution" (pp. 313-314).

Why was it that the Russian Revolution failed to reassert the ideal of political equality? According to Murry, it is because of a great deficiency in Marx, the prophet of the Russian Revolution, and in Marxist theory.

Marx wrote as a German, conscious of the complete absence of any spiritual struggle in the direction of political equality in that country. Knowing this, Marx had to look about him for some other driving force for political change and invented the idea of *material necessity*, working upon the proletariat. This is a point of crucial weakness in Marxism. It accounts for "the bias in Marxism . . . toward the elimination of the moral and religious processes from history. Once you have got them out, however, you cannot get them back again; yet you cannot do without them. For material forces do *not* create their political equivalents. . . . Material force has to be *transmuted* into creative political power, and the only agent of that transmutation is selfless moral enthusiasm" (pp. 336, 337).

Rousseau is a greater prophet than Marx and the one with the message most needed for the modern age. For he saw that the creation of the ideal social order called for strenuous moral and spiritual effort on the part of every human being.

Murry anticipates the criticism of this doctrine that "society is to the Rousseauist what the kingdom of God is to the Christian," to which the author replies that Rousseau would have been glad to accept the label.

This also is true of J. Middleton Murry. The true direction of social change is toward a Christian goal. His book is in a sense a call for a revival of religion. But this does not mean a revival of institutional religion. It means a rediscovery of the roots of Christianity, particularly the worth of individual human life. Cromwell and his Army fought for Immediacy with God. Our fight today is for Immediacy with Man.

CARL E. PURINTON

Adelphi College

World Community. By WILLIAM PATON.
New York: The Macmillan Company,
1939. 192 pages. \$1.50.

The theme of this book is the Church; more specifically, the Church as the creator of a world community. It is written in the light of all that was done in the Oxford and Edinburgh conferences and of much first hand knowledge of the actual conditions under which the Church exists in our present day world. Mr. Paton was at one time general secretary of the National Christian Council of India, Burma and Ceylon and is now a secretary of the International Missionary Council.

A brief but cogent account is given of the break-up of old cultures in many parts of the world today and of the excessive claims of nationalism and racialism. It is shown how these secular absolutes deny the principle of a world community at the very time that physical and technical factors are making a world community of some kind almost mandatory upon the race.

In such a world crisis Mr. Paton finds in the Church the true principle and bond of world unity. His statement of the things that constitute the Church is illuminating. They are (1) the supreme worship of God, (2) the message of divine forgiveness, (3) the doctrine of man as object of God's love, (4) the law of love as solvent of the antithesis between individualism and social solidarity and (5) the universal character of the Christian fellowship.

With all due recognition of the disunity and spiritual impotence of the Christian Church the impressive fact is affirmed and emphasized that the world Church does actually exist and that it is in many ways bearing the characteristic fruits of its own mission in the creating of a world

fellowship. The fresh, factual and authoritative presentation of this new achievement of the Church makes *World Community* a valuable guide for the study of the Church's task today and the progress that is being made toward the accomplishing of that task. The simplicity and readability of the book and, for that matter, its brevity should not be allowed to obscure the fact that it deals with big issues in a way that can only be done by one whose knowledge is wide and whose understanding is deep and sound.

HUGH VERNON WHITE

Secretary, The American Board of Commissioners for Foreign Missions

Eastern Religions and Western Thought.

By S. RADHAKRISHNAN. New York: Oxford University Press, 1939. xiii + 394 pages. \$5.00.

When western students of psychological discipline, of the theory of non-violence, etc., are increasingly asking what the Orient has discovered about their areas of investigation, the publication of a book on Eastern Religions and Western Thought by the Professor of Eastern Religions and Ethics at Oxford would seem particularly timely.

The reader, however, who expects light on significant relationships between western thought and eastern religion is likely to be disappointed. Professor Radhakrishnan's book is, rather, a loose collection of separate lectures using second-hand material from Greek and Christian mystics—from Pythagoras to "AE"—to illustrate their "affinity of type" with Hindu mysticism, and their possible debt to India. The treatment is throughout repetitious and full of conventional generalizations on world-problems of the past and present, particularly the "spiritual waywardness" of the West today. If the author's aim, as set forth on page 117, is a mere introductory sketch, disclaiming

analysis of "the religious and philosophical problems," one wonders why the book should have been published, in view of existing studies by Otto, Heiler, Underhill and others. The impression of second-handedness is heightened by frequent quotations from western writers like Max Müller, Maeterlink, Will Durant, concerning the importance of Hindu thought. The author's indiscriminating use of western thinkers is illustrated by his mention of Schopenhauer's well-known interest in Buddhism, without any recognition of the extreme *dis-service* Schopenhauer rendered to Western understanding of Buddhism by forcing it into his own preconceived scheme of "negation of the 'Will-to-live.'"

A similar arbitrary misinterpretation of Hinduism is ably encountered in the most constructive lecture in the book, that on "Mysticism and Ethics in Hindu Thought," in which the author defends the positive values of mysticism against its critics. He particularly answers Schweitzer's condemnation of Hindu mysticism as "world-and-life-negating" (in *Indian Thought and Its Development*). "The contrast," Radhakrishnan suggests, "is not so much between Hinduism and Christianity as between religion and a self-sufficient humanism." He recalls the strongly other-worldly elements in Christianity itself, quoting Schweitzer's own assertion (in *The Quest of the Historical Jesus*) that Jesus' teaching was "purely and exclusively world-renouncing." Extremes of asceticism occur in Christianity as well as in Hinduism, and the Augustinian and Barthian emphasis upon man's total depravity illustrates the recurring tendency in West as well as East to deny the value of the material and physical world. But far from being "negative," Radhakrishnan insists, such otherworldliness is essential to true ethics, which must be rooted in a realm beyond the visible and temporal. "Renunciation, self-sacrifice, disinterested

service of humanity are not stimulated by the workings of natural law. . . . A meaningful ethical ideal must be transcendent to the immediate flow of events." Moreover, the mystical insight is essential to ethics in that it removes the "illusion of egoism" and so enables us to *see* our neighbor as ourself. Schweitzer considers that this "self-finding" has nothing to do with ethics: Radhakrishnan counters that to renounce the narrow horizon, the selfish interest, is an ethical process which transforms feeling and will as well as thought, and expresses itself in concern for the welfare of the world. Inner discipline and asceticism are not mere "escape," he urges, but forms of "inner action" which are necessary motivators of outward action, in West or East.

Answering another objection to Hinduism on the grounds of the allegedly non-ethical character of its "negative description of the Supreme," the author suggests a somewhat startling parallel between mystical "negative theology" and the Barthian tendency to regard God as "Unknown" and "Absolutely Other." He maintains that this "passionate antithesis between the real and unreal, the true and the false, gives the urgency to the religious effort." But he

fails to come to grips with the very real tendency of all "Great Question-Mark" theologies to obliterate ethical distinctions. At the same time his sharp criticism of Barthian dogmatism makes one wonder whether the tolerant, universalistic mysticism he admires would have the stamina to resist political totalitarianism.

The book as a whole illustrates the still-unbridged gap between Eastern religions and Western thought. Whereas an orthodox Protestant historian-of-religions like Kraemer, in *The Christian Message in a Non-Christian World*, regards the religions of the East as "primitive and naturalistic," Radhakrishnan, unable to understand why "Christians insist upon the uniqueness of Christianity, considers only Oriental mysticism or its Western counterparts to be truly "mature." . . . Much deeper comprehension of our "contrasting assumptions and symbols, overlying basically similar psychological and social needs, will be necessary before Western thinkers and Eastern religionists can even understand each other's languages.

TERESINA ROWELL

Smith College

PERSONNEL EXCHANGE

N-2—Man; B. A. (Bib. Lit.), Alma College; B. D. (O. T.), Chicago Presbyterian Seminary; Ph. D. (Egyptian), U. of Chicago. Desired subjects biblical literature and religion, old testament, ancient history.

R-4—Man; graduate Humanistisches Gymnasium; 1 yr. (theology), Friedberg, (Hess); Ph. D. (theology), University of Giessen. Desired subjects theology and biblical literature. Can teach philosophy, German, Latin, Greek and Hebrew.

H-3—Man; B. A. (Phil.), Davidson and Princeton; B. Th. (N. T.), Princeton Seminary; Th. D. (N. T.), Tuebingen. Desired subjects bible, philosophy, and related fields.

S-3—Woman: A. B. (Religion), American Univ.; Ph. D. Yale; fellow in N. T. at Bryn Mawr for one year. Seven year's teaching experience. Desired subjects N. T., O. T., Religion, Religious Education.

BOOK NOTICES

Youth Looks At Religion. By ARTHUR C. WICKENDEN. New York: Harper & Brothers, 1939. xi + 212 pages. \$1.50.

This will not be a critical review. I am going to recommend Dr. Wickenden's book heartily and tell why in as few words as possible. It is not because of any new or novel insight into the problems of the philosophy of religion and theology. The writer is a typical liberal teacher with a sympathetic interest in the points of view, both of the conservative and those newer radicals who have turned back toward reaction. But the work is unique for the way its discussions fit into the framework of the present undergraduate. The vocabulary, the illustrations, the selection of topics all show the marks of long and effective usage in a classroom where the program was not a theology to be indoctrinated, but a faith to be watered in the midst of the typical college wilderness.

Professor Wickenden is a teacher of religion in a state school where he has been doing for many years what all of us must do more and more, face all points of view and none with sympathy and conviction. The topics included in the discussions are dictated, he declares, "by the religious problems which he has found to be common among his students. They make an excellent outline for a course in orientation or introduction to religious philosophy: the motives, nature, and functions of religion; its relation to science; faith and authority; the existence of God; Christology; sin, prayer, and immortality; the church and its function in social change.

Some teachers are likely to feel that the treatment is too brief, for it entirely avoids the formidable treatises so common and so dear to philosophers and theologians. Students will be found in every class who are prepared to go beyond, and some helps in the form of bibliography are provided. Obviously no attempt has been made to say the last word, but every paragraph is pointed and alive with interest.

I would quarrel with the title, for obviously it is Dr. Wickenden looking at religion with some aid from his students. But the title will not hurt the sale of the book to the youth who ought to buy it.

One might pick some theoretical flaws, but I forbear. In trying to characterize the general

point of view of the book, I would say it is Christ-centered, theistic, and, with these qualifications, humanistic.

ALBION ROY KING

Cornell College

Archaeology and the New Testament. By STEPHEN L. CAIGER. New York: The Macmillan Company, 1939. x + 194 pages, VIII plates. \$1.40.

Students of the Bible have often observed, with regret, that the contributions of archaeology to the understanding of the New Testament have not been as numerous nor as spectacular as of the Old Testament. The New Testament covers a much shorter period of history than the Old; the contributions of archaeology have been largely linguistic, and these are not easily made known to the uninitiated; the discoveries bearing on the Old Testament have an element of romantic glamour lacking in the period of Christian beginnings; and on many of the questions which the layman would like to have the archaeologist's answer, he has been disappointed. For these and other reasons, books dealing with "Archaeology and the New Testament" are few, and the present volume fills, in a measure, a great need. It is intended as a companion volume, for the general reader, to the author's *Bible and Spade*, which deals only with the Old Testament.

The author first treats the subject of the personal relics of Christ, reaching the negative conclusion that "so far no relics of Christ or His Apostles have been discovered, the authenticity of which can be established or even made to seem probable on purely archaeological grounds" (p. 30). To some it may seem needless to devote a whole chapter to this subject, but it is well for the general reader to have a treatment as sane as this.

Then follows a sketch of Jerusalem in the first century, and of the holy places in that city. It is satisfying to see that Caiger believes there is more support for the traditional site of Golgotha and the Holy Sepulchre than for "Gordon's Calvary" and the Garden Tomb, which have little evidence of authenticity. Next, there is a listing and description of various sacred sites of Palestine and of the cities of St. Paul. Here the treatment is too sketchy and superficial to be of great value, seldom rising above the level of an ordinary guidebook.

The chapters on the inscriptions, the papyri, and

early Christian documents are sounder in treatment; the discussion of the papyri should prove of great interest to the general student.

One meets occasionally in this book with inaccuracies which apparently come from too great dependence on second-hand sources and from a surprising lack of acquaintance with some modern excavations. For example, the *Via Principalis* of Jerash (Gerasa) is certainly not Herodian (p. 46, but cf. pp. 90ff.). The famous city-plan there was conceived and begun not earlier than the middle of the first century, A. D. And it is most surprising at this late date to read that the "vast amphitheatre" of Jerash was for "nautical spectacles" (p. 91); it was a hippodrome.

In the matter of interpretation, statements such as the following are at least open to serious doubt: "The position of the ancient Altar of Sacrifice, indeed the actual base of the Altar [of the Jerusalem Temple], can still be seen exactly as it was from time immemorial and unto the days of our Lord" (p. 65); and "... there seems to be no good reason for doubting that the Grotto of the Nativity may be the true birthplace of our Lord" (p. 80).

On the whole, however, this book may be recommended as a sane and straightforward treatment of an important subject.

J. PHILIP HYATT

Wellesley College

One Generation and Another. By ROBERT RUSSELL WICKS. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1939. x + 191 pages. \$1.50.

This book is refreshing. Dean Wicks writes interestingly and clearly. He has managed to give a common sense treatment of family life for normal people. He would have the youth of the coming generation keep themselves and the homes which they are about to found wholesome and genuine. He writes of permanent and happy homes and how these qualities may be passed on from one generation to another.

The seven chapters of the book have as their titles: Design for a Home; The Power of Family Sentiment; Learning by Contagion; Early Religious Impressions; Traditional Practices; What Life Is Like; and Perplexities. Dean Wicks says in the Foreword that it is not his aim to discuss the problems on which so many households have been wrecked but to discuss what goes on in those homes where difficulties have been surmounted, happiness preserved, and trustworthy citizenship achieved. This reviewer feels that the author has succeeded admirably in his purpose. This is not

the only book, but one of the books, that I should like to see come into the hands of the youth of America.

Brothers College
Drew University

FRANK GLENN LANKARD

Making the Bible Live. By GEORGIA L. CHAMBERLIN. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1939. 384 pages. \$3.00.

Miss Chamberlin has written a book which should prove invaluable to parents and teachers who wish to present to young people an intelligent appreciation of the Old Testament. She has succeeded in bringing together most of the essential historical, literary and religious desiderata for an intelligent approach and in utilizing much of the new light shed upon the Old Testament by modern scholarly research. The book lives up to its title by virtue of the vivid way in which she has made the characters come alive in their environment.

Beginning with the book of Judges as an example of the dual character of the Biblical literature (i. e. "the early core plus the accretions of time"), the chapters move along through the Books of Samuel and Kings, the early traditions of the Hexateuch, the prophets (a stimulating chapter to each) and the post-exilic history and literature. In the chapter on the Judges especially, the author reveals her skill in showing how the old stories may be retold and revived.

Throughout the book, enough of the Biblical text is reproduced (using the American Translation by Smith and Goodspeed) to reveal the flavor and high-lights of the various books. Attention has been given also to problems and methods of presenting Old Testament materials by including in each chapter a section devoted to religious educational values and implications. There is no straining to find religious values for today where none exist in the record, but neither is there any dearth of stimulating suggestions concerning timely and needed emphases upon the values which do appear there.

Not only parents and teachers of youth, but ministers and serious laymen who desire an interestingly-written, non-technical introduction to the Old Testament, will find here a very readable and informing aid to their understanding.

A Companion to the Bible. By ABRAHAM J. FELDMAN. New York: Behrman's Jewish Book House, 1939. 174 pages. \$1.50.

A brief, popular handbook of information about the Bible for Jewish readers. Includes such data

and discussion as: meaning of "Bible," why read the Bible, Bible and culture, influence of Bible on law, religion, democracy, literature, etc., the Canon, Jewish and Christian views, very brief analysis of books, translations, curiosa concerning Bibles with unique names, favorite expressions and phrases. Problems of critical and historical scholarship as such are avoided in the text, but are given occasional recognition, especially in dating and dividing certain books.

JOHN W. FLIGHT

Haverford College

The Strophic Structure of Hebrew Poetry. By CHARLES F. KRAFT. Chicago; Chicago University Press, 1939. 117 pages. \$1.00.

One approaches such a volume as this with a certain attitude of suspicion in view of the large claims made for it on the "jacket" and in publisher's notices, and in view of the fact that the path of Old Testament scholarship is strewn with the remains of more or less discredited metrical systems. Dr. Kraft has essayed a hazardous task.

The fundamental fact about Hebrew poetry is its parallelism. Further than that we cannot go with any high degree of certainty. Sievers and others have sought to lead us into a fuller understanding of Hebrew metrical forms but a glance at the commentaries of Gunkel, Kittel, Schmidt and Staerk reveals how difficult it is to apply and interpret such systems. The present reviewer does not profess to be any "Metriker von Fach," but he distrusts any system that lays claim to finality. We have still a long way to go before metrical forms can be used as a textual aid in any satisfactory measure. Hebrew metres surprise by their apparent irregularity; there is nothing of the smooth flow of Greek and Latin measures.

The author of this volume surveys these modern theories with particular reference to strophic form and finds most of value in Desnoyers' theory. There can be little doubt as to the existence of strophic form in the poetry of the Old Testament—though not all will admit this—and the author has examined carefully the first book of the Psalter and here offers the evidence. The work is well done and the facts adduced support his case. At times his conclusions may seem somewhat precarious, for they rest, as all such conclusions must rest, on manipulation of the received text. It is true only within limits, perhaps very narrow limits, that "this book provides a new criterion for text criticism." That instrument must be used with extreme caution.

The work is rather poorly printed and mis-

takes are too frequent both in writing Hebrew and French. The writer reveals painstaking study and large research and the result of his labors should be to give a more precise understanding of the literary form of the "Praises of Israel" and a deeper insight into their meaning.

JOHN PATERSON

Drew University

The Basis of Israelite Marriage. By MILLAR BURROWS. New Haven: The American Oriental Society. 1938. viii + 72 pages. Paper bound. \$1.50.

This is a detailed and scholarly investigation into the question of the character of the financial transaction associated with Hebrew marriage. Was marriage simply a matter of purchase and ownership as assumed by many writers on Hebrew social life and custom, or was it something different? A few years ago such a question would have been discussed simply on the basis of the relevant Old Testament passages. Now it is necessary to take into consideration the literature and laws of the neighboring peoples, and interpret the Old Testament passages in the light of these. This book is an interesting example of the present breadth of Old Testament studies. The method is to trace lines backward from the culture of the neighboring people as well as of Israel to see if they converge toward a common point in the unknown past. The arguments for and against the idea of "purchase" as the equivalent of *mohar* and similar words in other languages are carefully listed. Then alternative explanations are examined, and the author comes to the conclusion that "compensation-gift" is the correct term for the idea involved. The reader is bound to ask just wherein this differs from the idea of purchase. Burrows admits that in practice the three kinds of transactions described as barter, sale, and gift shade into one another. But he insists, and rightly, in the opinion of this reviewer, that not only is there a difference between the purchase of a bondswoman and the securing of a wife, but that complete identification of the *mohar* and a purchase-price is prevented "by the personal and social nature of the marriage relationship so that marriage and slavery would always remain clearly distinguished." Of course the ideal would sometimes be dragged in the dust, but it is well to discern the mental attitude which lay behind the marriage transaction in its origin and was largely continued through the centuries.

ELBERT C. LANE

Hartford Theological Seminary

A Hellenistic Greek Reader. By ERNEST CADMAN COLWELL AND JULIUS R. MANTEY. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1939. xv + 229 pages. \$2.00.

By the publication of this book, the authors have made a distinct contribution to the growing interest in the study of New Testament Greek. Heretofore college and seminary classes wishing to study the Greek of the New Testament period have had to use bulky, expensive works, for the most part without notes or vocabulary. This work presents an excellent variety of selections, and is well provided with notes and a special vocabulary.

In addition to the Septuagint and the New Testament, the authors have chosen wisely from such early Christian writers as Ignatius, Clement, and Justin, as well as the Didache, from Philo and Josephus, from the pagans Diodorus Siculus, Strabo, and Epictetus, and ten papyri. The closing sections of Enoch, and the story of the baptized lion from the apocryphal Acts of Paul are two selections representing recent papyrus discoveries. The selections have general as well as linguistic interest.

A full bibliography is included, and there is an introductory section on the general linguistic tendencies of Koine Greek. The book is published by the planograph process, and the typing has been done with especial care.

F. W. GINGRICH

Albright College

Ain Shems Excavations (Palestine). Part IV (Pottery). By ELIHU GRANT AND G. ERNEST WRIGHT. (Biblical and Kindred Studies No. 7, Haverford College, Haverford, Pennsylvania) Haverford, 1938. LXX Plates.

This volume of plates, with accompanying descriptions, is the fifth report published on the modern excavations at Ain Shems, ancient Beth Shemesh. This site has been especially fruitful in the study of Philistine culture, and has yielded a few important epigraphic remains.

In the present volume the field director has had the assistance of Dr. G. Ernest Wright, now of the Presbyterian Theological Seminary in Chicago, who has made important contributions to the study of Palestinian ceramics. Devoted chiefly to pottery, but containing pictures of various other finds, this report will be found very useful when read in connection with the previous reports and the final text-volume, to be published soon, which will be

virtually definitive for the Beth Shemesh excavations.

J. PHILIP HYATT

Wellesley College

Essential Christianity. By SAMUEL ANGUS. New York: Macmillan Company, 1939. 226 pages \$2.00.

The substance of three addresses delivered at such widely separated points as Melbourne, Australia, California and Oxford has been brought together in *Essential Christianity* which is "written for laymen at the suggestion of a layman." The chapter headings are "The Problem," "Towards an Answer," "Essential Christianity" and "Christianity and Creed."

Prof. Shannon once said that the Gospel of John is a book with a few great ideas to which the writer returns again and again. Something of the same sort might be said of this book though the "returning" is not a matter of weary repetition but rather of approaching the same point from a new vantage ground. In this book the author strives valiantly and with great success to distinguish the essence of Christianity from authoritarian creeds, institutions, or dogmas. It ought to be a text book for all conferences on "faith and order."

Dr. Angus is a mature scholar of wide learning. One of the most impressive features of his book is the use of supporting material from historic sources and contemporary thinkers. A few examples chosen at random reveal the quality of this selected material: "Mysticism . . . is 'reason in its most exalted mood,'" "Prayer is the only adequate confession of faith," "A faith which does not doubt is a dead faith," and many others equally trenchant. While meeting its objective, it is more than a book for laymen. Ministers will greatly profit by it if they approach it without dogmatic prejudice. Teachers will likewise find this a stimulating book which commends itself by its quality as well as by the learning and professional standing of the author who is himself a teacher.

RAYMOND R. BREWER

The James Millikin University

Saint Catherine of Siena. By JOHANNES JORGENSEN. New York: Longmans, Green and Co., 1938. 446 pages. \$3.50.

To read this life of the fourteenth century saint is to dwell for a time in a world that seems at first incredibly strange and remote. This feeling is produced not mainly by the exterior aspects of the

world of the middle ages, although the reader may by his reading gain a new respect for the modern emphasis upon public health and sanitation! "Those who at the present day walk through the narrow, dark and ill-smelling streets in the Ghetto of Siena, can obtain a faint impression of the horrors that the cities of the Middle Ages offered to the senses" (p. 181). The citizen of a twentieth century world perpetually on the brink of international and civil war may well feel at home in fourteenth century Italy with its continual feuds.

It is the interior life, the religious psychology, portrayed in this book which will seem foreign to the modern, at least, to the non-Catholic reader. The author uses without apology the language of visions, voices, and miracles. Add to this the extreme ascetic practices of Catherine of Siena and she becomes a medieval figure indeed.

The author confesses that when he began his study of Saint Catherine he found himself less sympathetic than he had been toward Saint Francis of whom he had made an earlier study. This was due to the fact that "in the energetic nature of the Sienese saint there is something of a domineering spirit, an element of tyranny. . . ." Nevertheless, in the end Jorgensen became a zealous "Caterinato." This is likely to be the experience of the reader. It is true that Catherine was possessed of an imperious will, but in wrestling with it she learned much about the proper relation of the human will to the will of God. Says the author, interpreting Catherine:

"There are two kinds of love in man, the love of God and of his fellow man, and the love of the world. There are two wills, the will of God and self-will. One of these two forces, love of the world, self-will, leads to interior unrest, sin, unhappiness, everything evil and everlasting loss. The other love of God and one's neighbour, leads to interior peace, health of the soul, every virtue and everlasting life" (p. 92).

Perhaps it was this naturally aristocratic temperament which made it possible for the Sienese saint to be "no respecter of persons." At any rate, the modern reader warms to her prophetic denunciation of the failures of the medieval church and her challenges to the popes to take up their role of spiritual leadership.

The writer permits himself an occasional dig at Protestant reformers like Hus, Luther, and Calvin, comparing them unfavorably with Catherine who remained within the church to do her work of renewal (pp. 175, 201).

Nevertheless, this is a book which may be read

with inspiration and profit by Catholic and non-Catholic alike.

CARL E. PURINTON

Adelphi College

How Our Religion Began. By EDNA M. BAXTER. New York: Harper and Brothers, 1939. vii-xiv, 225 pages. \$2.50.

Miss Baxter intended "*How Our Religion Began*" to be used as a course of study for pupils from the ages of eleven to sixteen (P. 198). Although this has been planned as a text for a complete unit, it would seem to the reviewer that it might better be used as a source book. In it, the teacher of the Pioneer ages will find very valuable supplementary material for any course in the history and development of the Hebrew religion or as a background for the understanding of the Prophets. It is so interestingly and attractively written that the young people themselves can use it as a source book for illuminating many of the Bible customs and ideas unfamiliar to Western thought. Miss Baxter has described the Egyptian and Babylonian origins of many Hebrew beliefs and has shown how these have been remodeled and refined by the inspired creative genius of the Hebrew writers. Young people are helped to see the progressive steps by which God has led his people to ever higher concepts of himself and of his plans for mankind. Miss Baxter's scholarly but understanding approach to the Book of Books will be in keeping with that scientific attitude with which high school students are taught to study all literature, and thus will serve to convince them of the eternal validity of the truth in the Bible. Well selected and attractive Egyptian and Babylonian drawings are distributed through the book which is exceptionally well edited. We may sincerely congratulate Miss Baxter for having made a timely and valuable contribution to literature needed for use among earnest intelligent High School students and for interpreters of the Bible who have been searching for just such a readable volume based on recent and authoritative Biblical research.

NAROLA RIVENBURG

Baptist Institute, Philadelphia, Pa.

Children's Worship in the Church School. By JEANNETTE E. PERKINS. New York: Harper and Brothers, 1939. 233 pages. \$2.00.

What Miss Perkins does in this valuable book is to share her experience as supervisor in meeting the needs of the primary department of the Riverside Church School in New York.

The material is organized in six sections under

the headings: "From Wonder to Worship," "Social and Ethical Problems in Worship," "Christmas as an Approach to the Life of Jesus," "World Friendship—The Appreciation and Enjoyment of People of Different Nationalities," "Death and Continuing Life," and "Binding Together the Experiences of Several Groups: Finding God in the Process." Each section contains an introductory chapter discussing the aim and method of using each type of material, together with one or more specimen services. The larger part of each section consists of source material in the form of Bible verses, litanies, poems, etc., gathered from far and near, much of the material having been composed or compiled by the author herself. At the end of the book is a section in which songs with both words and music have been brought together bearing upon the six subjects dealt with in the book.

Each section is of distinct value. Perhaps for personal reasons, the reviewer was less drawn to the first topic presenting God through the wonder and beauty of nature. We have a feeling that this approach to religion may be and has been overdone. Indeed we seem to have overdone it in our own family, where one child was heard to remark inconsequently, "You think we live in a wonderful world, don't you. Well, I don't." To be sure this was a bit of playful negativism. Nevertheless, there is a lesson in it. Christianity is something more than an emotional response to the beauty and order of nature. We welcome, accordingly, the other areas suggested by Miss Perkins for the cultivation of the worship experience. She seems indeed to anticipate the feeling expressed above, when in the chapter devoted to social and ethical problems she comments: "Christians must be sensitive to more than beauty and goodness. They must recognize also the disharmony and tragedy in the universe. The world which man has made is filled with wrongs waiting to be righted, sufferings which can be alleviated, cruelties which must be displaced by good will and kindness" (p. 41). In dealing with such problems it is important to observe her caution that no despairing note should be struck and that the positive side of the problems be emphasized.

Another helpful suggestion, chosen at random from numerous wise recommendations in the book, has to do with the use of the Christmas season. Miss Perkins advises using this period as an occasion for an appreciation of Jesus not as the baby but as the man. "It is through appreciation of the life and the spirit of the man and the difference he made to the world that his birth becomes significant" (p. 83).

The primary department leader who turns to this book Saturday evening for a ready-made service of worship for the next morning will not find it particularly helpful. It will be found useful by the teacher or department superintendent who is constantly aware of the actual interests and needs of her pupils as they are expressed and wishes a source book to which to be able to turn to meet such needs. No doubt there are parents, too, who will find the book helpful to them as they attempt to guide the religious development of their children in the home.

CARL E. PURINTON

Adelphi College

Mesillat Yescharim. The Path of the Upright.

By MOSES HAYYIM LUZZATTO. A Critical Edition Provided With a Translation and Notes. By MORDECAI M. KAPLAN. Philadelphia: The Jewish Publication Society of America, 1936. XXXVII + 230 pages. \$2.50.

The spirit and the essence of Judaism, as adapted to and translated into daily life, is best revealed in the many ethical treatises and the "Ethical Wills" of the Middle Ages. For here we meet face to face with "pure ethics" in the garb of "practical reason." He who would know the Jew and the laws and principles which guide his every move and action will find it indispensable to make the first hand acquaintance of the "moral guides" which regulated, even as they still regulate, Jewish secular and religious life. He will then discover that Judaism has but a single standard of morals binding alike for the Jew's relations with the Gentiles and his coreligionists; he will further discover that the Jewish credo "love thy neighbor as thyself" is universal and all-embracing and that Judaism does not condone the least infraction of pure or practical ethics.

"The Path of the Upright" by the Cabalist Rabbi Moses Hayyim Luzzatto (b. 1707; d. 1747) is among the most popular Jewish ethical treatises. For generations it has been studied by pious Jews in quest of purity and saintliness. Because of the singular importance of Luzzatto's ethical guide it is doubly welcome that it is now, for the first time, available to the English reader. Although Professor Kaplan's English version of a "critical text" of "Mesillath Yescharim" frequently departs considerably from the original and is, as a whole, anything but accurate, it is useful because it opens up the rich storehouse of Luzzatto's ethics to those unable to peruse the original.

Luzzatto's "ideal Jew" is the "Saint." Jewish saintliness, however, is not attained by abstinence and the rejection of "this" world but by living

a full life, disciplining the "evil instinct" and sublimating the grossly physical until it is transformed into pure spirituality. In the twenty-six chapters of his book Luzzatto analyses and advocates with great eloquence and literary skill the importance of the ethical and religious duties commanded in the Torah and elaborated by the Sages of the Talmud. The burden of the message of Luzzatto's ethical guide is that human freedom and dignity are solely attained by the voluntary acceptance of a discipline designed to restrain the "animal instincts" and to fan the divine spark in every human soul into a bright, warming, and steady flame.

Luzzatto's "Path of the Upright" is a "must" book for every teacher of Bible and Religion.

TRUDE WEISS ROSMARIN

The School of the Jewish Woman

The Church Follows Its Students. By CLARENCE PROUTY SHEDD. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1938. 328 + xviii pages. \$2.50.

Professor Shedd had already given us an exhaustive and authoritative chronicle of the student Young Men's and Young Women's Christian Associations at work among college students (*Two Centuries of Student Christian Movements*, Association Press, 1934). The record of the Christian approach to the universities is now completed by this account of the rapid rise and development of denominationally sponsored work for students.

But *The Church Follows its Students* is much more than a historical record. Inwoven in the narrative is appraisal of the most important causes and meanings of the facts which guides the reader into the great issues of educational and religious philosophy at stake. And narrative and appraisal lead on to forecast of future developments. Indeed, among the most valuable sections of the book is the concluding chapter in which, with sure insight and scrupulous fairness, the author raises the paramount query for the Christian enterprise in the student field today—shall the various denominations which thus far have been content to carry forward work on individual campuses without regional or national student organizations continue in the policy, or shall they create inter-collegiate student structures roughly paralleling the long-established Christian Association movement? As Christianity seeks to bring its impact upon a higher education increasingly indifferent to organized religion, shall it be as churches or as *The Church*?

Dr. Shedd is the unchallenged authority in this field. His two volumes are definitive. But they are also fascinating and illuminating records. They are indispensable basic reading for anyone contemplating religious work with students, or for anyone desiring to be intelligent upon the problems.

HENRY P. VAN DUSEN

Union Theological Seminary

